

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Measurement of quark- and gluon-like jet fractions using jet charge in PbPb and pp collisions at 5.02 TeV

The CMS collaboration

2020-07-17

The CMS Collaboration , Sirunyan , A M , Eerola , P , Forthomme , L , Kirschenmann , H , Österberg , K , Voutilainen , M , Garcia , F , Havukainen , J , Heikkilä , J K , Karimäki , V , Kim , M S , Kinnunen , R , Lampen , T , Lassila-Perini , K , Laurila , S , Lehti , S , Linden , T , Luukka , P , Siikonen , H , Tuominen , E , Tuominiemi , J & Tuuva , T 2020 , ' Measurement of quark- and gluon-like jet fractions using jet charge in PbPb and pp collisions at 5.02 TeV ' , Journal of High Energy Physics , no. 7 , 115 . [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07\(2020\)115](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2020)115)

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/321656>

[https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07\(2020\)115](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP07(2020)115)

cc_by

publishedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

RECEIVED: April 1, 2020

REVISED: May 26, 2020

ACCEPTED: May 29, 2020

PUBLISHED: July 17, 2020

Measurement of quark- and gluon-like jet fractions using jet charge in PbPb and pp collisions at 5.02 TeV



The CMS collaboration

E-mail: cms-publication-committee-chair@cern.ch

ABSTRACT: The momentum-weighted sum of the electric charges of particles inside a jet, known as jet charge, is sensitive to the electric charge of the particle initiating the parton shower. This paper presents jet charge distributions in $\sqrt{s_{\text{NN}}} = 5.02$ TeV lead-lead (PbPb) and proton-proton (pp) collisions recorded with the CMS detector at the LHC. These data correspond to integrated luminosities of $404 \mu\text{b}^{-1}$ and 27.4 pb^{-1} for PbPb and pp collisions, respectively. Leveraging the sensitivity of the jet charge to fundamental differences in the electric charges of quarks and gluons, the jet charge distributions from simulated events are used as templates to extract the quark- and gluon-like jet fractions from data. The modification of these jet fractions is examined by comparing pp and PbPb data as a function of the overlap of the colliding Pb nuclei (centrality). This measurement tests the color charge dependence of jet energy loss due to interactions with the quark-gluon plasma. No significant modification between different centrality classes and with respect to pp results is observed in the extracted quark- and gluon-like jet fractions.

KEYWORDS: Hadron-Hadron scattering (experiments), Heavy-ion collision, Jets

ARXIV EPRINT: [2004.00602](https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.00602)

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	The CMS detector	2
3	Event selection and simulated event samples	3
4	Jet and track reconstruction	4
5	Jet charge measurement	5
6	Corrections for background and detector effects	5
7	Template fitting	6
8	Systematic uncertainties	7
9	Results	10
10	Summary	12
A	Jet charge measurements	15
	The CMS collaboration	22

1 Introduction

High-momentum partons produced by hard scatterings in heavy ion collisions undergo energy loss as they traverse the quark-gluon plasma (QGP) created in these interactions [1]. The mechanisms by which these partons lose energy to the medium, as well as their color dependence, are still not fully understood [2, 3]. The particles resulting from the fragmentation and hadronization of these partons can be clustered into jets. Jets are used as parton proxies to examine the properties of the QGP. Parton energy loss manifests itself in various experimental observables including the suppression of high transverse momentum (p_T) hadrons and jets [4–8], as well as modifications of parton showers [9, 10]. These phenomena are collectively referred to as jet quenching [1].

At leading order in quantum chromodynamics, the type of parton that initiates a jet can be distinguished. The resulting jet can therefore be labeled as a quark, antiquark, or gluon jet. Several recent measurements indicate that the fractions of quark and gluon jets in a sample may be modified as they are expected to suffer different energy loss in the QGP due to their different color charges [11, 12]. This analysis explores the extraction of the fractions of quark and gluon jets from an inclusive jet sample in lead-lead (PbPb) and proton-proton (pp) collisions. This is achieved with a template-fitting method using

the “jet charge” observable. Jet charge, defined as the momentum-weighted sum of the electric charges of particles inside a jet, is sensitive to the electric charge of the particle initiating a parton shower and can be used to discriminate between gluon- and quark-initiated jets. This observable was initially suggested as a way of measuring the electric charge of a quark [13] and was first measured in deep inelastic scattering experiments at Fermilab [14, 15], CERN [16–19], and Cornell University [20].

More recently, jet charge was measured at the LHC in pp collisions by the ATLAS [21] and CMS [22] collaborations, characterizing the contributions of quark and gluon fragmentation to jet production. At LHC energies, gluon contributions dominate jet production at lower transverse momenta, while the valence quark contributions overtake at higher jet p_T [23]. According to predictions from the PYTHIA event generator (version 6.424 [24], tune Z2 [25]) for pp collisions at 5.02 TeV, gluon jets are expected to constitute about 59% of a sample of jets with transverse momenta above 120 GeV. Similarly, up and down (anti)quark jets are predicted to make up about 32% of the sample with the other 9% arising from charm, strange and bottom (anti)quark jet contributions. A detailed investigation of jet charge and its applications in heavy ion collisions is motivated by extensive theoretical calculations [23, 26, 27]. The dependence of the mean and width (standard deviation) of the jet charge distribution on both jet energy and size, can be calculated independently of Monte Carlo (MC) fragmentation models despite the large experimental uncertainty in fragmentation functions [28]. This makes jet charge a suitable variable for the determination of quark and gluon jet fractions.

This paper presents the first jet charge measurements in heavy ion collisions along with pp jet charge results at the same center-of-mass energy per nucleon pair ($\sqrt{s_{NN}}$). The analysis uses PbPb and pp data at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV, both collected in 2015 with the CMS detector at the CERN LHC. The data correspond to an integrated luminosity of $404 \mu\text{b}^{-1}$ (27.4 pb^{-1}) for PbPb (pp) collisions [29]. In heavy ion collisions, the discrimination between jet and background constituents is not straightforward and often impossible on a per-particle basis. In this work, “background” is defined as uncorrelated and long-range correlated contributions [30], as measured at least 1.5 units of relative pseudorapidity ($\Delta\eta$) away from the jet axis [10, 31, 32], which do not arise from the jet-initiating parton shower. Any short-range modifications to either the medium or the jet structure are thus included in the jet “signal”. The measurements are corrected for detector and background effects using an unfolding procedure, and are presented as a function of the overlap of the colliding Pb nuclei (centrality). The jet charge distributions of light (anti)quark and gluon jets from MC generators are used as templates to fit the inclusive jet charge distribution measured in data. The fractions of quark- and gluon-initiated jets are extracted from this fitting procedure and are referred to as quark- and gluon-like jet fractions. The results are presented as a function of the minimum p_T threshold of the particles used in the jet charge measurement and also as a function of a p_T weighting factor, κ [26].

2 The CMS detector

The central feature of the CMS apparatus is a superconducting solenoid of 6 m internal diameter, providing a magnetic field of 3.8 T. Within the solenoid volume are a silicon

pixel and strip tracker, a lead tungstate crystal electromagnetic calorimeter (ECAL), and a brass and scintillator hadron calorimeter (HCAL), each composed of barrel and endcap sections. Two hadron forward (HF) steel and quartz-fiber calorimeters complement the barrel and endcap detectors, extending the calorimeter from the range $|\eta| < 3.0$ provided by the barrel and endcap out to $|\eta| < 5.2$. Events of interest are selected using a two-tiered trigger system [33].

In this analysis, jets are reconstructed within the range $|\eta| < 1.5$. In the region $|\eta| < 1.74$, the HCAL cells have widths of 0.087 in both η and azimuth ϕ . Within the central barrel region corresponding to $|\eta| < 1.48$, the HCAL cells map onto 5×5 ECAL crystal arrays to form calorimeter towers projecting radially outwards from the nominal interaction point. Within each tower, the energy deposits in ECAL and HCAL cells are summed to define the calorimeter tower energies, which are subsequently clustered to reconstruct the jet energies and directions [34]. The silicon tracker measures charged-particle tracks within $|\eta| < 2.5$. It consists of 1440 silicon pixel and 15 148 silicon strip detector modules. For charged particles with $1 < p_T < 10$ GeV in the barrel region, the track resolutions are typically 1.5% in p_T and 25–90 (45–150) μm in the transverse (longitudinal) impact parameter [35]. A detailed description of the CMS detector, together with a definition of the coordinate system used and the relevant kinematic variables, can be found in ref. [36].

3 Event selection and simulated event samples

The PbPb and pp data are selected with a calorimeter-based trigger that uses the anti- k_T jet clustering algorithm with a distance parameter of $R = 0.4$ [37]. The trigger requires events to contain at least one jet with $p_T > 80$ GeV. This trigger is fully efficient for events containing jets with reconstructed $p_T > 100$ GeV. The data selected by this trigger are referred to as “jet-triggered”, and corresponds to 3.35 (2.6) million PbPb (pp) collision events. Vertex and noise filters are applied to both PbPb and pp data to reduce contamination from noncollision events (e.g., beam-gas interactions), as described in previous analyses [10, 38]. Additionally, a primary vertex with at least 2 tracks is required to be reconstructed and have a z position (v_z) within 15 cm of the center of the nominal interaction region along the beam axis. In PbPb collisions, the shapes of clusters in the pixel detector are required to be compatible with those expected from a PbPb collision event. The PbPb events are also required to have at least three towers in each of the HF calorimeters with energy deposits of more than 3 GeV per tower.

Simulated MC samples are used to evaluate the performance of the event reconstruction, in particular the track reconstruction efficiency and the jet energy response and resolution. The MC samples use the PYTHIA (version 6.424 [24], tune Z2 [25]) event generator to describe the hard scattering, parton showering, and hadronization of the partons and are referred to as the PYTHIA6 sample. To account for the soft underlying PbPb event, the hard PYTHIA6 interactions are embedded into simulated minimum-bias PbPb events produced with HYDJET (version 1.383 [39]). This minimum-bias event generator is tuned to reproduce global event properties such as the charged-hadron p_T spectrum and particle multiplicity. The combined sample of hard PYTHIA6 interactions and soft HYDJET underly-

ing event is referred to as the PYTHIA6+HYDJET sample. The GEANT4 [40] toolkit is used to simulate the CMS detector response.

The scalar p_T sum of the HF calorimeter towers ($3.0 < |\eta| < 5.2$) is used to define the event centrality in PbPb events and to divide the event sample into centrality classes, each representing a percentage of the total inelastic hadronic cross section [41]. Events in PbPb collisions are divided into four centrality intervals corresponding to 0–10% (most central), 10–30%, 30–50%, and 50–100% (most peripheral).

Because of the large number of nucleon-nucleon interactions in head-on PbPb collisions, jets are more likely to be reconstructed in more central events. Requiring a jet to be present in an event, therefore, biases the data sample toward more central collisions. In comparison, the PYTHIA6+HYDJET sample consists of a flat distribution of jets (from PYTHIA6), as a function of centrality. Thus, a centrality-based reweighting is applied to this MC sample to match the centrality distribution of the jet-triggered PbPb data. An additional reweighting procedure is performed to match the simulated v_z distributions to data for both the PbPb and pp samples. The contribution of pile-up in both PbPb and pp collisions is negligible [29].

4 Jet and track reconstruction

The jet reconstruction in PbPb and pp events is performed with the anti- k_T jet algorithm with a distance parameter of $R = 0.4$, as implemented in the FASTJET framework [42]. Individually calibrated calorimeter towers are used as inputs to the algorithm. Only calorimeter information is used in the jet reconstruction to minimize the bias of the tracking efficiency on the reconstruction of jets. In PbPb collisions, the contributions of the underlying event are subtracted using a two-iteration variant of the “noise/pedestal subtraction” technique described in refs. [43, 44]. In this method, only calorimeter towers outside of the jet area are used in the background estimation after identifying and excluding the jets in the first iteration. The underlying event and pile-up contribution is negligible in pp collisions and therefore do not require any subtraction. In both PbPb and pp events, jet energy is calibrated and the calorimeter response is verified as a function of jet p_T and η . To account for the variation in detector response with the total number of jet constituents, additional corrections are applied in both collision systems based on the number of charged-particle tracks with $p_T > 2$ GeV within the jet cone (relative angular distance from the jet axis $\Delta r = \sqrt{(\Delta\eta)^2 + (\Delta\phi)^2} < 0.4$), the jet p_T , and the collision centrality [10]. This corrects for a difference in the simulated calorimetric jet energy response between quark and gluon jets and reduces the difference in response between the two jet flavors from 10% to around 3%. After reconstruction and offline jet energy calibration, jets are required to have $p_T > 120$ GeV and $|\eta| < 1.5$. In this kinematic range, the jet trigger is observed to be fully efficient and the jet energy response and resolution is optimized. Within this selection, it is possible for multiple jets to be selected from the same event.

For pp collision events, charged-particle tracks are reconstructed using an iterative tracking method [35] that finds tracks within $|\eta| < 2.4$ down to $p_T = 0.1$ GeV. For the PbPb data an alternative iterative reconstruction procedure is employed because of the large track

multiplicities [45, 46]. It is capable of reconstructing tracks down to $p_T = 0.4$ GeV. The charge of the particle is measured based on the direction of curvature of the reconstructed track. Tracks used in this measurement are required to have a relative p_T uncertainty of less than 10% (30%) in PbPb (pp) collisions and also satisfy the standard track quality requirements [38]. For both collision systems, it is required that the significance of the distance of closest approach to at least one primary vertex in the event be less than 3 standard deviations, in order to decrease the likelihood of counting nonprimary charged particles originating from secondary decay products. Tracks with $p_T > 20$ GeV are required to have an associated energy deposit [47] of at least half their momentum in the calorimeters to reduce the contribution of misreconstructed tracks with very high p_T . In PbPb collisions, tracks must additionally be associated with at least 11 hits and satisfy a fit quality requirement that the χ^2 , divided by both the number of degrees of freedom and the number of tracker layers hit, be less than 0.15 [38]. The tracking efficiency in pp collisions is approximately 90% for $p_T > 1$ GeV. Track reconstruction is more difficult in the heavy ion environment because of the large track multiplicity, and so the tracking efficiency ranges from approximately 60% at $p_T = 1$ GeV to about 70% at $p_T = 10$ GeV [38].

5 Jet charge measurement

The jet charge is defined as:

$$Q^\kappa = \frac{1}{(p_T^{\text{jet}})^\kappa} \sum_{i \in \text{jet}} q_i p_{T,i}^\kappa. \quad (5.1)$$

The variable p_T^{jet} is the transverse momentum of the calorimeter jet. The q_i and $p_{T,i}$ symbols refer to the electric charge (in terms of the proton charge e) and transverse momentum of the i -th particle in the jet cone, respectively. The κ parameter controls the weighting of the jet charge variable to low- and high- p_T particles in the jet cone. Low values of κ enhance the contribution from low- p_T particles to the jet charge, and vice versa.

Tracks with $p_T > 1$ GeV that are located within the jet cone ($\Delta r < 0.4$) are used in the jet charge measurement. The track p_T threshold of 1 GeV ensures that the MC templates for different flavors used in the fitting procedure are well resolved and also reduces the contributions of uncorrelated and long-range correlated background to the jet charge. Theoretical predictions suggest that a parameter value p_T -weighting factor $\kappa \approx 0.5$ is the most sensitive to the electric charge of the parton initiating the jet in vacuum [26]. In this analysis, measurements are shown for κ values of 0.3, 0.5, and 0.7, and with different selections on the minimum track p_T of 1, 2, 4, and 5 GeV to retain a broad sensitivity to both hard and soft radiation inside jets.

6 Corrections for background and detector effects

To allow for a comparison with future measurements from other experiments or theoretical predictions, the jet charge distributions are unfolded from the detector to the final-state hadron particle level. The jet charge measurements at the detector level are broadened by track reconstruction inefficiencies, and this effect increases with decreasing κ values. In

PbPb collisions, there is additional smearing that is caused by the background from the underlying event and long-range correlations [30]. The unfolding is performed to account for these effects using the D’Agostini iterative method [48–50], as implemented in the ROOUNFOLD software package [51]. Response matrices are derived from PYTHIA6 and PYTHIA6+HYDJET simulation samples for pp and PbPb collisions, respectively.

Response matrices in the unfolding procedure are constructed using jet charge distributions measured with reconstructed tracks, and that measured with generator-level particles originating from the hard scattering. To account for the background effects in PbPb collisions, the reconstructed tracks used in constructing the response matrices includes contributions from both the hard scattering and background as modeled by PYTHIA6+HYDJET. As a cross check of the background estimation procedure, a data-driven technique is also used to measure the uncorrelated and long-range correlated contributions, as further discussed in section 8. No background correction is required in pp collisions because of the negligible underlying event and pile-up contribution [29].

The number of iterations in the unfolding procedure trades off bias towards MC with statistical fluctuations. To obtain an optimal number of iterations, reconstructed jet charge distributions from modified samples of PYTHIA6 and PYTHIA6+HYDJET are unfolded using the nominal response matrices. Quark and gluon jet fractions are varied by 50% in the modified simulation samples, which is expected to give a good bound on the potential modification of the jet charge distribution in data [23]. Based on these studies, three to four iterations are used in the unfolding procedure for different selections of threshold track p_T and κ .

7 Template fitting

The flavor-tagged jet charge distributions from PYTHIA6 at the generator-level are used as templates to fit the unfolded jet charge measurement to estimate the fractions of quark and gluon jets. Measurements from PYTHIA6 simulations for jets initiated by up quarks (mean = $0.254e$, width = $0.341e$), down quarks (mean = $-0.150e$, width = $0.335e$), and gluons (mean = $0.001e$, width = $0.364e$) are well separated and make up the dominant fractions of the sample. The quoted mean and width values for the different-flavor jets are from measurements at the generator-level, with a minimum track p_T threshold of 1 GeV and a κ value of 0.5. They have statistical uncertainties of less than 0.1%. The average jet charge for jets initiated by quarks and gluons varies by less than 1% as a function of the jet p_T in PYTHIA6, allowing for the stable extraction of the respective jet fractions in the p_T range examined here. In the fitting procedure, the fractions of up antiquark jets (\bar{u}) and down antiquark jets (\bar{d}), are varied along with the up and down quark jets, respectively. Jets initiated by charm, strange, and bottom (anti)quarks (\bar{c} , c , \bar{s} , s , \bar{b} , and b , respectively) are categorized as “other flavor” jets and their fractions are fixed during the fitting procedure to reduce the number of degrees of freedom. The fitting procedure takes into consideration the total systematic uncertainty in the jet charge measurements from all sources combined with the statistical uncertainty.

A small fraction of jets have no reconstructed tracks inside the jet cone above the threshold track p_T used in the jet charge measurement. This fraction is negligible for a track p_T threshold of 1 GeV in both collision systems but goes up to 10 (6)% in central PbPb (pp) collisions for a track p_T threshold of 5 GeV. Such jets, with no reconstructed tracks inside the jet cone, are excluded in the fitting procedure, and the fractions of quarks and gluons for such jets are assigned directly from simulation. The related systematic uncertainty is discussed in section 8. Previous CMS results have shown a large excess of soft particles in PbPb events relative to pp events up to $\Delta r \sim 1$ from the jet axis, compensated by a relative depletion of higher- p_T tracks [10, 52]. Consequently, the fraction of jets with no high- p_T tracks is observed to be 50% higher in PbPb data compared to PYTHIA6+HYDJET predictions for the most central collisions.

For a given jet energy, jets with a harder constituent p_T spectrum are more likely to be reconstructed because the calorimeter response does not scale linearly with the incident particle energy, resulting in a bias toward the selection of jets with fewer associated tracks. On average, quark jets have harder fragmentation than gluon jets and are therefore preferentially reconstructed. Jet energy corrections based on the number of jet constituents are applied to reduce the difference in the response between quark and gluon jets from 10 to around 3% (see section 4). To compensate for the residual difference, an extra correction factor, based on the deviation from unity in the response, is applied to the extracted fractions of quark- and gluon-like jets [10].

8 Systematic uncertainties

A number of sources of systematic uncertainty are considered, including effects from the unfolding, tracking efficiencies, background correction, jet reconstruction, and the contributions from “other flavor” jets. To estimate most systematic uncertainties, a quantity is varied by an appropriate amount in the construction of the response matrix and propagated through the full analysis chain. The fitting procedure is repeated on the varied distributions and the deviation from the nominal results are assigned as systematic uncertainties. The systematic uncertainties from all sources are added in quadrature. The relative uncertainties in the measured jet charge distributions vary for different selections of p_T -weighting factor κ and track p_T threshold.

An uncertainty of 5 (4)% in PbPb (pp) data is considered to account for possible differences in track reconstruction between data and simulation, including reconstruction of misreconstructed tracks [38]. The reconstruction efficiency is varied by this amount when populating the response matrices used in the data unfolding. The resulting jet charge distributions are fit with the generator-level templates and the differences in the extracted fractions of quark- and gluon-like jets, observed to be 1–2%, are quoted as a source of systematic uncertainty.

From simulation studies, the difference in the tracking efficiencies for positively and negatively charged particles is found to be 0.5% in both PbPb and pp collisions regardless of the particle p_T . This uncertainty is propagated to the final result in a way similar to what is used for the tracking reconstruction difference between data and simulation,

i.e., the unfolding response matrices are modified and any differences after applying the template fitting procedure are taken as systematic uncertainties.

To study the systematic effect arising from the choice of the MC event generator to produce the response matrix used in the unfolding procedure, a response matrix is formed using a modified PYTHIA6 sample with varied quark and gluon jet fractions, and both of these matrices are used to unfold the data. In this study, quark and gluon jet fractions are varied by 50% from their nominal MC values while populating the modified response matrices. The fitting procedure is repeated on the resulting varied unfolded distributions and the deviation from the nominal fitting results are then assigned as a systematic uncertainty. Other sources of uncertainty in the unfolding procedure include effects from bin-to-bin correlations in the unfolded distribution and the statistical uncertainty in the MC simulation of the response matrix elements. They are propagated using covariance matrices constructed with the ROOUNFOLD software package. These studies result in a relative uncertainty of 4–7% on the extracted jet fractions. Additional studies are performed using PYTHIA8 v212 [53] tune CUETP8M1 [54] and HERWIG++ 2.7.1 [55] tune EE5C [56] event generators, neither of which are observed to describe the jet spectra in pp data very well. After reweighting the jet spectra in these MC samples to match data, while jet charge distributions from PYTHIA8 are in very good agreement with those from PYTHIA6 and data, HERWIG++ overestimates the width of the data jet charge distributions and are hence not used in systematic uncertainty studies.

The systematic uncertainty due to the jet energy resolution is estimated by changing the jet energy resolution by 5% to cover the corresponding uncertainty [34], followed by a comparison of the modified spectra with the nominal spectrum. The corresponding differences in the extracted quark- and gluon-like jet fractions, estimated from repeating the fitting procedure on the smeared jet charge distributions, are 1–3% and are included as systematic uncertainties. The effects of the angular resolution of the jet axis are negligible in the jet charge measurements.

To study the background modelling uncertainty in PbPb collisions, the response matrices are also built using a data-driven reference event technique to estimate the uncorrelated and long-range correlated background contributions. The jet charge is measured using jets in a jet-triggered “signal” event and tracks from a separate minimum-bias “reference” event which is required to have a v_z within 1 cm and collision centrality within 2.5% of the signal event. The signal and reference events must also have similar charged particle multiplicities outside of the jet cone. The background obtained from the reference event technique is observed to be in close agreement with that for HYDJET and the resulting uncertainty is less than 1%. No background subtraction is performed in pp due to its negligible effect, and hence no corresponding systematic uncertainty is assigned.

The contribution from jets with no tracks in the jet cone above a p_T threshold, which are excluded in the fitting procedure, to the gluon-like jet fraction measurements is assigned from MC. The difference in the fraction of such jets between data and MC increases with increasing track p_T threshold and with more central collisions because of the observed depletion of high- p_T tracks in PbPb collisions [10, 52]. This difference is less than 1% in pp collisions but can reach 4.5% in PbPb collisions. It is assigned as a systematic uncertainty.

Source	pp	PbPb centrality intervals			
		50–100%	30–50%	10–30%	0–10%
Response matrix modelling	4–6	5–7.5	5–7.5	5–7.5	5–7.5
Monte Carlo event count	1.5	3	3	3	3
Jet energy resolution	1–1.5	2	2	2–3	2–3
Tracking efficiency (data/simulation)	1	2	2	2	2
Tracking efficiency (positive/negative)	0.5–1	1–1.5	1–1.5	0.5–1.5	0.5–1.5
Jets with no tracks	0.1	0.2–1	0.4–2	0.4–3	0.5–4.5
Unfolding procedure	0.5	0.7	0.8	1.1	1.4
Background modelling and fluctuation	—	0.5	0.5	1	1
“Other flavor” jets	1	1	1	1	1
Total	4–5	7–8	7–8	7–8	7–9

Table 1. Relative systematic uncertainties in percentage for the measurements of gluon-like jet fractions in pp and PbPb events. The PbPb results are given in intervals of centrality. When an uncertainty range is given, the range of the values are the maximum variation in the fractions for different selections on κ and track p_T threshold values.

In PbPb data, there is an additional bias toward selecting jets that are reconstructed on upward fluctuations in the underlying event. Since the jet spectrum is steeply falling, more jets on upward fluctuations are included in the sample than jets on downward fluctuations are excluded resulting in an uncertainty of up to 10% in the measured particle multiplicity in central PbPb events [10]. This effect is observed to be included in the reconstructed jet charge measurements in simulation as well, so the difference in this bias between data and MC is used to calculate the corresponding systematic uncertainty. To calculate this difference, distributions of the particle multiplicities within cones ($\Delta r < 0.4$), chosen randomly in detector η and ϕ , are compared between minimum-bias data and MC events [10, 52] and are found to be in very good agreement with each other. The difference is propagated through the analysis chain and the resulting deviation from the nominal results are observed to be negligible.

To assess the effects of the statistical uncertainties from the MC templates on the final results, 1000 pseudo-experiments are performed by generating smeared jet charge templates based on its statistical uncertainty and repeatedly fitting the data measurements using these templates. The distributions of extracted gluon-like jet fractions from the pseudo-experiment fits have a variance of 3% or less, which is assigned as a systematic uncertainty due to limited MC event count.

Finally, the effect of fixing the “other flavor” jet fractions in the fitting procedure is analyzed. The “other flavor” jets, comprising c (2.9%), s (4.7%) and b (1.7%) (anti)quarks, are each varied by their total amount in the fitting procedure and the resulting deviation from the nominal fitting result is propagated as a systematic uncertainty.

A summary of the range of systematic uncertainties for results is shown in table 1 for different selections of κ and track p_T threshold values.




Figure 1. (Upper) Unfolded jet charge measurements shown for inclusive jets in data along with the extracted fractions of up, and down quark jets, gluon jets, and the “other flavor” jets. The systematic and statistical uncertainties in the distributions are shown by the shaded regions and vertical bars, respectively. The jet charge measurements shown here are for the p_T -weighting factor $\kappa = 0.5$ and a minimum track p_T of 1 GeV. (Lower) Ratio of the jet charge measurements to the results of template fits.

9 Results

The unfolded jet charge measurements, normalized to the total number of jets in the sample (N_{jets}), are shown in the upper panels of figure 1 with solid black points for a sample selection with a minimum track p_T of 1 GeV and p_T -weighting factor $\kappa = 0.5$. The results are shown for pp and different event centrality bins in PbPb. The extracted fraction of quark- and gluon-initiated jets is displayed as a set of stacked histograms. Figure 1 also shows the ratio of the data over the template fit results in the lower panels, and no significant deviation from unity is observed in the entire fitting range. The fractions of up and down quarks are observed to be significantly different between pp and PbPb collisions, as expected from an enhanced contribution of valence down quarks in lead collisions (having 126 neutrons and 82 protons in each nucleus). The jet charge measurements and fit results for other minimum track p_T and κ selections are shown in figures 5–7 in the appendix.

The widths (standard deviations) of the unfolded data jet charge distributions in different PbPb event centrality bins and in pp, with various track p_T thresholds and κ values, are shown in figure 2. They are also compared to generator-level predictions from PYTHIA6 with matching track p_T and κ selections in figure 2. The data (simulation) results for $\kappa = 0.3$, 0.5, and 0.7, are shown by the blue squares (solid lines), red crosses (dashed lines), and green diamonds (dotted lines), respectively. The measured standard deviations tend to increase as a function of the minimum track p_T and decrease with increasing κ value. Theoretical predictions incorporating color-charge dependence into jet energy loss calculations predict that stronger quenching of gluon jets will result in a reduced fraction of gluon-initiated jets in the observed jet sample from PbPb collisions compared to that in pp data [27]. The mean of the jet charge distribution for gluon-initiated jets is consistently predicted to be zero in various MC simulations, while that of quark jets is nonzero. A decrease in the fraction of gluons in a quenched jet sample would hence lead to an effective increase in the standard deviation of the measured jet charge distribution.




Figure 2. The standard deviation of the jet charge distributions with different track p_T thresholds and κ values for pp collisions and in the various event centrality bins for PbPb collisions compared with the PYTHIA6 prediction. The systematic and statistical uncertainties in the standard deviation measurements are shown by the shaded regions and vertical bars, respectively.




Figure 3. Fitting results for the extraction of gluon-like jet fractions in pp and PbPb data shown for different track p_T threshold values and event centrality bins in PbPb collisions. The systematic and statistical uncertainties are represented by the shaded regions and vertical bars, respectively. The predictions for the gluon jet fractions from PYTHIA6 are shown in dashed red lines.

Figure 2 summarizes standard deviations measured for all track p_T selections and κ values studied. The generator-level PYTHIA6 predictions agree with the measured widths for pp events. No strong modifications are observed in the widths of the jet charge distributions in central PbPb collisions compared to the peripheral events. While the PbPb width results cannot be directly compared to the pp reference due to different up and down quark contents in protons and Pb nuclei, generator-level PYTHIA6 predictions adjusted for this difference reproduce the observed widths of jet charge measurements for all PbPb collision centralities.

The results for the quark- and gluon-like jet fractions in an inclusive sample are shown in figure 3 as a function of the track p_T threshold. Figure 4 shows the same quantities as a function of κ for track $p_T > 1$ and > 2 GeV, with red circles and blue crosses, respectively. The systematic uncertainties are shown by the shaded regions while the statistical uncertainties, combined with the fit uncertainties, are shown by the solid vertical bars. Only the gluon jet fitting results are shown in figures 3 and 4 for clarity but it should be inferred that the quark jets make up the rest of the inclusive sample.

Previous CMS measurements have shown a strong modification in the distribution of low- p_T tracks relative to the jet axis in PbPb collisions with respect to pp collisions [10, 52]. In-medium gluon radiation and a wake-like response of the QGP to the propagating parton




Figure 4. Fitting results for the extraction of gluon-like jet fractions in pp and PbPb data shown for p_T -weighting factor κ values of 0.3, 0.5, and 0.7 in different event centrality bins in PbPb. The markers for track $p_T > 1$ and > 2 GeV have been separated horizontally for clarity. The systematic and statistical uncertainties are represented by the shaded regions and vertical bars, respectively. The predictions for the gluon jet fractions from PYTHIA6 are shown in dashed red lines.

are two of the proposed explanations for this modification [57], neither of which are expected to modify the jet charge considerably. From figures 3 and 4, no significant modification is observed in the relative fractions of the quark- and gluon-like jets in central PbPb collisions compared to peripheral PbPb and pp collisions. The relative jet fractions are also observed to be unmodified when calculated using a range of different track p_T thresholds or κ values.

10 Summary

Jet charge, defined as the momentum-weighted sum of the electric charges of particles inside a jet, is measured for the first time in heavy ion collisions and is presented along with pp results at the same energy. The analysis uses lead-lead (PbPb) and proton-proton (pp) collision data collected with the CMS detector at a nucleon-nucleon center-of-mass energy of 5.02 TeV. The unfolded jet charge distributions, measured using the jet constituents with transverse momentum $p_T > 1$ GeV for jets having $p_T > 120$ GeV and pseudorapidity $|\eta| < 1.5$, are presented. The widths of the jet charge distributions for pp collisions are in good agreement with predictions from the event generator PYTHIA6 and are shown to be independent of PbPb collision centrality. The jet charge distributions for quark- and gluon-initiated jets from PYTHIA6 events are used as fitting templates to estimate the respective contributions in the measured jet samples. The gluon-like jet fractions extracted from these template fits are found to be similar between pp data and all studied PbPb centrality ranges. These are the first measurements in heavy ion collisions which exploit the electric charge of the initiating parton to discriminate between quark and gluon jets. No evidence is seen for a significant decrease (increase) in gluon-like (quark-like) prevalence in a sample of jets with $p_T > 120$ GeV in PbPb collisions. These observations do not support recent interpretations of other heavy ion results [11, 12], which are based on a decreased (increased) gluon (quark) fraction caused by color-charge dependent jet quenching.

Acknowledgments

We congratulate our colleagues in the CERN accelerator departments for the excellent performance of the LHC and thank the technical and administrative staffs at CERN and at

other CMS institutes for their contributions to the success of the CMS effort. In addition, we gratefully acknowledge the computing centers and personnel of the Worldwide LHC Computing Grid for delivering so effectively the computing infrastructure essential to our analyses. Finally, we acknowledge the enduring support for the construction and operation of the LHC and the CMS detector provided by the following funding agencies: BMBWF and FWF (Austria); FNRS and FWO (Belgium); CNPq, CAPES, FAPERJ, FAPERGS, and FAPESP (Brazil); MES (Bulgaria); CERN; CAS, MoST, and NSFC (China); COLCIENCIAS (Colombia); MSES and CSF (Croatia); RPF (Cyprus); SENESCYT (Ecuador); MoER, ERC IUT, PUT and ERDF (Estonia); Academy of Finland, MEC, and HIP (Finland); CEA and CNRS/IN2P3 (France); BMBF, DFG, and HGF (Germany); GSRT (Greece); NKFIA (Hungary); DAE and DST (India); IPM (Iran); SFI (Ireland); INFN (Italy); MSIP and NRF (Republic of Korea); MES (Latvia); LAS (Lithuania); MOE and UM (Malaysia); BUAP, CINVESTAV, CONACYT, LNS, SEP, and UASLP-FAI (Mexico); MOS (Montenegro); MBIE (New Zealand); PAEC (Pakistan); MSHE and NSC (Poland); FCT (Portugal); JINR (Dubna); MON, RosAtom, RAS, RFBR, and NRC KI (Russia); MESTD (Serbia); SEIDI, CPAN, PCTI, and FEDER (Spain); MOSTR (Sri Lanka); Swiss Funding Agencies (Switzerland); MST (Taipei); ThEPCenter, IPST, STAR, and NSTDA (Thailand); TUBITAK and TAEK (Turkey); NASU (Ukraine); STFC (United Kingdom); DOE and NSF (U.S.A.).

Individuals have received support from the Marie-Curie program and the European Research Council and Horizon 2020 Grant, contract Nos. 675440, 752730, and 765710 (European Union); the Leventis Foundation; the A.P. Sloan Foundation; the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office; the Fonds pour la Formation à la Recherche dans l’Industrie et dans l’Agriculture (FRIA-Belgium); the Agentschap voor Innovatie door Wetenschap en Technologie (IWT-Belgium); the F.R.S.-FNRS and FWO (Belgium) under the “Excellence of Science — EOS” — be.h project n. 30820817; the Beijing Municipal Science & Technology Commission, No. Z191100007219010; the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports (MEYS) of the Czech Republic; the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) under Germany’s Excellence Strategy — EXC 2121 “Quantum Universe” — 390833306; the Lendület (“Momentum”) Program and the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the New National Excellence Program ÚNKP, the NKFIA research grants 123842, 123959, 124845, 124850, 125105, 128713, 128786, and 129058 (Hungary); the Council of Science and Industrial Research, India; the HOMING PLUS program of the Foundation for Polish Science, cofinanced from European Union, Regional Development Fund, the Mobility Plus program of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education, the National Science Center (Poland), contracts Harmonia 2014/14/M/ST2/00428, Opus 2014/13/B/ST2/02543, 2014/15/B/ST2/03998, and 2015/19/B/ST2/02861, Sonata-bis 2012/07/E/ST2/01406; the National Priorities Research Program by Qatar National Research Fund; the Ministry of Science and Education, grant no. 14.W03.31.0026 (Russia); the Tomsk Polytechnic University Competitiveness Enhancement Program and “Nauka” Project FSWW-2020-0008 (Russia); the Programa Estatal de Fomento de la Investigación Científica y Técnica de Excelencia María de Maeztu, grant MDM-2015-0509 and the Programa Severo Ochoa del Principado de Asturias; the

Thalis and Aristeia programs cofinanced by EU-ESF and the Greek NSRF; the Rachadapisek Sompot Fund for Postdoctoral Fellowship, Chulalongkorn University and the Chulalongkorn Academic into Its 2nd Century Project Advancement Project (Thailand); the Kavli Foundation; the Nvidia Corporation; the SuperMicro Corporation; the Welch Foundation, contract C-1845; and the Weston Havens Foundation (U.S.A.).

A Jet charge measurements




Figure 5. (Upper row of each figure) Unfolded jet charge measurements shown for inclusive jets in data along with the extracted fractions of up, and down quark jets, gluon jets, and the “other flavor” jets. The systematic and statistical uncertainties in the distributions are shown by the shaded regions and vertical bars, respectively. The jet charge measurements shown here are for $\kappa = 0.5$ and a minimum track p_T of 2, 4, and 5 GeV (top, middle, and bottom, respectively). (Lower row of each figure) Ratio of the jet charge measurements to the results of template fits.




Figure 6. (Upper row of each figure) Unfolded jet charge measurements shown for inclusive jets in data along with the extracted fractions of up, and down quark jets, gluon jets, and the “other flavor” jets. The systematic and statistical uncertainties in the distributions are shown by the shaded regions and vertical bars, respectively. The jet charge measurements shown here are for a minimum track p_T of 1 GeV and a κ value of 0.3, 0.5, and 0.7 (top, middle, and bottom, respectively). (Lower row of each figure) Ratio of the jet charge measurements to the results of template fits.




Figure 7. (Upper row of each figure) Unfolded jet charge measurements shown for inclusive jets in data along with the extracted fractions of up, and down quark jets, gluon jets, and the “other flavor” jets. The systematic and statistical uncertainties in the distributions are shown by the shaded regions and vertical bars, respectively. The jet charge measurements shown here are for a minimum track p_T of 2 GeV and a κ value of 0.3, 0.5, and 0.7 (top, middle, and bottom, respectively). (Lower row of each figure) Ratio of the jet charge measurements to the results of template fits.

Open Access. This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License ([CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)), which permits any use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited.

References

- [1] J.D. Björken, *Energy loss of energetic partons in QGP: possible extinction of high p_T jets in hadron-hadron collisions*, FERMILAB-PUB-82-059-THY (1982) and online pdf version at <http://lss.fnal.gov/archive/preprint/fermilab-pub-82-059-t.shtml> [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [2] J. Casalderrey-Solana and C.A. Salgado, *Introductory lectures on jet quenching in heavy ion collisions*, in *Cracow School of Theoretical Physics*, proceedings of the 47th Course 2007: *New Developments in Astrophysics and Astroparticle Physics*, Zakopane, Poland, 14–22 June 2007, *Acta Phys. Polon.* **B 38** (2007) 3731 [[arXiv:0712.3443](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [3] A. Majumder and M. Van Leeuwen, *The Theory and Phenomenology of Perturbative QCD Based Jet Quenching*, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **66** (2011) 41 [[arXiv:1002.2206](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [4] STAR collaboration, *Direct observation of dijets in central Au + Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97** (2006) 162301 [[nucl-ex/0604018](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [5] ATLAS collaboration, *Observation of a Centrality-Dependent Dijet Asymmetry in Lead-Lead Collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.77$ TeV with the ATLAS Detector at the LHC*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** (2010) 252303 [[arXiv:1011.6182](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [6] CMS collaboration, *Observation and studies of jet quenching in PbPb collisions at nucleon-nucleon center-of-mass energy = 2.76 TeV*, *Phys. Rev. C* **84** (2011) 024906 [[arXiv:1102.1957](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [7] PHENIX collaboration, *Suppressed π^0 production at large transverse momentum in central Au + Au collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 200$ GeV*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91** (2003) 072301 [[nucl-ex/0304022v1](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [8] ALICE collaboration, *Measurement of jet suppression in central Pb–Pb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV*, *Phys. Lett. B* **746** (2015) 1 [[arXiv:1502.01689](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [9] ATLAS collaboration, *Measurement of jet fragmentation in Pb + Pb and pp collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV with the ATLAS detector*, *Phys. Rev. C* **98** (2018) 024908 [[arXiv:1805.05424](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [10] CMS collaboration, *Jet properties in PbPb and pp collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV*, *JHEP* **05** (2018) 006 [[arXiv:1803.00042](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [11] M. Spousta and B. Cole, *Interpreting single jet measurements in Pb + Pb collisions at the LHC*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) 50 [[arXiv:1504.05169v1](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [12] ALICE collaboration, *Exploration of jet substructure using iterative declustering in pp and Pb–Pb collisions at LHC energies*, *Phys. Lett. B* **802** (2020) 135227 [[arXiv:1905.02512](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [13] R.D. Field and R.P. Feynman, *A parametrization of the properties of quark jets*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **136** (1978) 76.
- [14] FERMILAB-SERPUKHOV-MOSCOW-MICHIGAN collaboration, *Net Charge in Deep Inelastic Antineutrino-Nucleon Scattering*, *Phys. Lett. B* **91** (1980) 311 [[INSPIRE](#)].

- [15] J.P. Berge et al., *Quark Jets from Antineutrino Interactions 1: Net Charge and Factorization in the Quark Jets*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **184** (1981) 13 [INSPIRE].
- [16] AACHEN-BONN-CERN-MUNICH-OXFORD collaboration, *Multiplicity Distributions in Neutrino-Hydrogen Interactions*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **181** (1981) 385 [INSPIRE].
- [17] AACHEN-BONN-CERN-MUNICH-OXFORD collaboration, *Charge Properties of the Hadronic System in νp and $\bar{\nu} p$ Interactions*, *Phys. Lett. B* **112** (1982) 88 [INSPIRE].
- [18] EUROPEAN MUON collaboration, *Quark Charge Retention in Final State Hadrons From Deep Inelastic Muon Scattering*, *Phys. Lett. B* **144** (1984) 302 [INSPIRE].
- [19] AMSTERDAM-BOLOGNA-PADUA-PISA-SACLAY-TURIN collaboration, *Charged Hadron Multiplicities in High-energy $\bar{\nu}_\mu n$ and $\bar{\nu}_\mu p$ Interactions*, *Z. Phys. C* **11** (1982) 283 [Erratum *ibid.* **C 14** (1982) 281] [INSPIRE].
- [20] R. Erickson et al., *Charge Retention in Deep Inelastic Electroproduction*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42** (1979) 822 [Erratum *ibid.* **42** (1979) 1246] [INSPIRE].
- [21] ATLAS collaboration, *Measurement of jet charge in dijet events from $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV pp collisions with the ATLAS detector*, *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) 052003 [arXiv:1509.05190] [INSPIRE].
- [22] CMS collaboration, *Measurements of jet charge with dijet events in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV*, *JHEP* **10** (2017) 131 [arXiv:1706.05868] [INSPIRE].
- [23] H.T. Li and I. Vitev, *Jet charge modification in dense QCD matter*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 076020 [arXiv:1908.06979] [INSPIRE].
- [24] T. Sjöstrand, S. Mrenna and P.Z. Skands, *PYTHIA 6.4 Physics and Manual*, *JHEP* **05** (2006) 026 [hep-ph/0603175] [INSPIRE].
- [25] R. Field, *Early LHC Underlying Event Data — Findings and Surprises*, in proceedings of the 21st Hadron Collider Physics Symposium, Toronto, Canada, 23–27 August 2010, arXiv:1010.3558 [INSPIRE].
- [26] W.J. Waalewijn, *Calculating the Charge of a Jet*, *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 094030 [arXiv:1209.3019] [INSPIRE].
- [27] S.-Y. Chen, B.-W. Zhang and E.-K. Wang, *Jet charge in high energy nuclear collisions*, *Chin. Phys. C* **44** (2020) 024103 [arXiv:1908.01518] [INSPIRE].
- [28] D. Krohn, M.D. Schwartz, T. Lin and W.J. Waalewijn, *Jet Charge at the LHC*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110** (2013) 212001 [arXiv:1209.2421] [INSPIRE].
- [29] CMS collaboration, *CMS Luminosity Calibration for the pp Reference Run at $\sqrt{s} = 5.02$ TeV*, CMS-PAS-LUM-16-001 (2016) [INSPIRE].
- [30] CMS collaboration, *Long-range and short-range dihadron angular correlations in central PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV*, *JHEP* **07** (2011) 076 [arXiv:1105.2438] [INSPIRE].
- [31] CMS collaboration, *Decomposing transverse momentum balance contributions for quenched jets in PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV*, *JHEP* **11** (2016) 055 [arXiv:1609.02466] [INSPIRE].
- [32] CMS collaboration, *Correlations between jets and charged particles in PbPb and pp collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV*, *JHEP* **02** (2016) 156 [arXiv:1601.00079] [INSPIRE].
- [33] CMS collaboration, *The CMS trigger system*, 2017 JINST **12** P01020 [arXiv:1609.02366] [INSPIRE].

- [34] CMS collaboration, *Determination of Jet Energy Calibration and Transverse Momentum Resolution in CMS*, **2011 JINST** **6** P11002 [[arXiv:1107.4277](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [35] CMS collaboration, *Description and performance of track and primary-vertex reconstruction with the CMS tracker*, **2014 JINST** **9** P10009 [[arXiv:1405.6569](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [36] CMS collaboration, *The CMS Experiment at the CERN LHC*, **2008 JINST** **3** S08004 [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [37] M. Cacciari, G.P. Salam and G. Soyez, *The anti- k_t jet clustering algorithm*, **JHEP** **04** (2008) 063 [[arXiv:0802.1189](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [38] CMS collaboration, *Charged-particle nuclear modification factors in PbPb and pPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 5.02$ TeV*, **JHEP** **04** (2017) 039 [[arXiv:1611.01664](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [39] I.P. Lokhtin and A.M. Snigirev, *A Model of jet quenching in ultrarelativistic heavy ion collisions and high- p_T hadron spectra at RHIC*, **Eur. Phys. J. C** **45** (2006) 211 [[hep-ph/0506189](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [40] GEANT4 collaboration, *GEANT4: A Simulation toolkit*, **Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A** **506** (2003) 250 [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [41] CMS collaboration, *Jet momentum dependence of jet quenching in PbPb collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV*, **Phys. Lett. B** **712** (2012) 176 [[arXiv:1202.5022](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [42] M. Cacciari, G.P. Salam and G. Soyez, *FastJet User Manual*, **Eur. Phys. J. C** **72** (2012) 1896 [[arXiv:1111.6097](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [43] M. Cacciari and G.P. Salam, *Pileup subtraction using jet areas*, **Phys. Lett. B** **659** (2008) 119 [[arXiv:0707.1378](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [44] O. Kodolova, I. Vardanyan, A. Nikitenko and A. Oulianov, *The performance of the jet identification and reconstruction in heavy ions collisions with CMS detector*, **Eur. Phys. J. C** **50** (2007) 117 [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [45] CMS collaboration, *Study of high- p_T charged particle suppression in PbPb compared to pp collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV*, **Eur. Phys. J. C** **72** (2012) 1945 [[arXiv:1202.2554](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [46] CMS collaboration, *Modification of Jet Shapes in PbPb Collisions at $\sqrt{s_{NN}} = 2.76$ TeV*, **Phys. Lett. B** **730** (2014) 243 [[arXiv:1310.0878](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [47] CMS collaboration, *Particle-flow reconstruction and global event description with the CMS detector*, **2017 JINST** **12** P10003 [[arXiv:1706.04965](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [48] G. D'Agostini, *A Multidimensional unfolding method based on Bayes' theorem*, **Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A** **362** (1995) 487 [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [49] W.H. Richardson, *Bayesian-based iterative method of image restoration*, **Opt. Soc. Am.** **62** (1972) 55.
- [50] L.B. Lucy, *An iterative technique for the rectification of observed distributions*, **Astron. J.** **79** (1974) 745 [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [51] T. Adye, *Unfolding algorithms and tests using RooUnfold*, in proceedings of the **PHYSTAT 2011 Workshop on Statistical Issues Related to Discovery Claims in Search Experiments and Unfolding**, CERN, Geneva, Switzerland, 17–20 January 2011, pp. 313–318 [[arXiv:1105.1160](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].

- [52] CMS collaboration, *Measurement of transverse momentum relative to dijet systems in PbPb and pp collisions at $\sqrt{s_{\text{NN}}} = 2.76$ TeV*, *JHEP* **01** (2016) 006 [[arXiv:1509.09029](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [53] T. Sjöstrand et al., *An introduction to PYTHIA 8.2*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **191** (2015) 159 [[arXiv:1410.3012](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [54] CMS collaboration, *Event generator tunes obtained from underlying event and multiparton scattering measurements*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) 155 [[arXiv:1512.00815](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [55] M. Bahr et al., *HERWIG++ Physics and Manual*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **58** (2008) 639 [[arXiv:0803.0883](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [56] M.H. Seymour and A. Siodmok, *Constraining MPI models using σ_{eff} and recent Tevatron and LHC Underlying Event data*, *JHEP* **10** (2013) 113 [[arXiv:1307.5015](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [57] J. Casalderrey-Solana, D. Gulhan, G. Milhano, D. Pablos and K. Rajagopal, *Angular Structure of Jet Quenching Within a Hybrid Strong/Weak Coupling Model*, *JHEP* **03** (2017) 135 [[arXiv:1609.05842](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].

The CMS collaboration

Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia

A.M. Sirunyan[†], A. Tumasyan

Institut für Hochenergiephysik, Wien, Austria

W. Adam, F. Ambrogio, T. Bergauer, M. Dragicevic, J. Erö, A. Escalante Del Valle, M. Flechl, R. Frühwirth¹, M. Jeitler¹, N. Krammer, I. Krätschmer, D. Liko, T. Madlener, I. Mikulec, N. Rad, J. Schieck¹, R. Schöffbeck, M. Spanring, W. Waltenberger, C.-E. Wulz¹, M. Zarucki

Institute for Nuclear Problems, Minsk, Belarus

V. Drugakov, V. Mossolov, J. Suarez Gonzalez

Universiteit Antwerpen, Antwerpen, Belgium

M.R. Darwish, E.A. De Wolf, D. Di Croce, X. Janssen, A. Lelek, M. Pieters, H. Rejeb Sfar, H. Van Haevermaet, P. Van Mechelen, S. Van Putte, N. Van Remortel

Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium

F. Blekman, E.S. Bols, S.S. Chhibra, J. D'Hondt, J. De Clercq, D. Lontkovskyi, S. Lowette, I. Marchesini, S. Moortgat, Q. Python, S. Tavernier, W. Van Doninck, P. Van Mulders

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

D. Beghin, B. Bilin, B. Clerbaux, G. De Lentdecker, H. Delannoy, B. Dorney, L. Favart, A. Grebenyuk, A.K. Kalsi, L. Moureaux, A. Popov, N. Postiau, E. Starling, L. Thomas, C. Vander Velde, P. Vanlaer, D. Vannerom

Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium

T. Cornelis, D. Dobur, I. Khvastunov², M. Niedziela, C. Roskas, K. Skovpen, M. Tytgat, W. Verbeke, B. Vermassen, M. Vit

Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

O. Bondu, G. Bruno, C. Caputo, P. David, C. Delaere, M. Delcourt, A. Giammanco, V. Lemaitre, J. Prisciandaro, A. Saggio, M. Vidal Marono, P. Vischia, J. Zobec

Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Fisicas, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

G.A. Alves, G. Correia Silva, C. Hensel, A. Moraes

Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

E. Belchior Batista Das Chagas, W. Carvalho, J. Chinellato³, E. Coelho, E.M. Da Costa, G.G. Da Silveira⁴, D. De Jesus Damiao, C. De Oliveira Martins, S. Fonseca De Souza, H. Malbouisson, J. Martins⁵, D. Matos Figueiredo, M. Medina Jaime⁶, M. Melo De Almeida, C. Mora Herrera, L. Mundim, H. Nogima, W.L. Prado Da Silva, P. Rebello Teles, L.J. Sanchez Rosas, A. Santoro, A. Sznajder, M. Thiel, E.J. Tonelli Manganote³, F. Torres Da Silva De Araujo, A. Vilela Pereira

Universidade Estadual Paulista^a, Universidade Federal do ABC^b, São Paulo, Brazil

C.A. Bernardes^a, L. Calligaris^a, T.R. Fernandez Perez Tomei^a, E.M. Gregores^b, D.S. Lemos, P.G. Mercadante^b, S.F. Novaes^a, SandraS. Padula^a

Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria

A. Aleksandrov, G. Antchev, R. Hadjiiska, P. Iaydjiev, M. Misheva, M. Rodozov, M. Shopova, G. Sultanov

University of Sofia, Sofia, Bulgaria

M. Bonchev, A. Dimitrov, T. Ivanov, L. Litov, B. Pavlov, P. Petkov, A. Petrov

Beihang University, Beijing, China

W. Fang⁷, X. Gao⁷, L. Yuan

Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

M. Ahmad, Z. Hu, Y. Wang

Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China

G.M. Chen⁸, H.S. Chen⁸, M. Chen, C.H. Jiang, D. Leggat, H. Liao, Z. Liu, A. Spiezia, J. Tao, E. Yazgan, H. Zhang, S. Zhang⁸, J. Zhao

State Key Laboratory of Nuclear Physics and Technology, Peking University, Beijing, China

A. Agapitos, Y. Ban, G. Chen, A. Levin, J. Li, L. Li, Q. Li, Y. Mao, S.J. Qian, D. Wang, Q. Wang

Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, China

M. Xiao

Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia

C. Avila, A. Cabrera, C. Florez, C.F. González Hernández, M.A. Segura Delgado

Universidad de Antioquia, Medellin, Colombia

J. Mejia Guisao, J.D. Ruiz Alvarez, C.A. Salazar González, N. Vanegas Arbelaez

University of Split, Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering and Naval Architecture, Split, Croatia

D. Giljanović, N. Godinovic, D. Lelas, I. Puljak, T. Sculac

University of Split, Faculty of Science, Split, Croatia

Z. Antunovic, M. Kovac

Institute Rudjer Boskovic, Zagreb, Croatia

V. Brigljevic, D. Ferencek, K. Kadija, B. Mesic, M. Roguljic, A. Starodumov⁹, T. Susa

University of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus

M.W. Ather, A. Attikis, E. Erodotou, A. Ioannou, M. Kolosova, S. Konstantinou, G. Mavromanolakis, J. Mousa, C. Nicolaou, F. Ptochos, P.A. Razis, H. Rykaczewski, H. Saka, D. Tsiakkouri

Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

M. Finger¹⁰, M. Finger Jr.¹⁰, A. Kveton, J. Tomsa

Escuela Politecnica Nacional, Quito, Ecuador

E. Ayala

Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador

E. Carrera Jarrin

**Academy of Scientific Research and Technology of the Arab Republic of Egypt,
Egyptian Network of High Energy Physics, Cairo, Egypt**

M.A. Mahmoud^{11,12}, Y. Mohammed¹¹

National Institute of Chemical Physics and Biophysics, Tallinn, Estonia

S. Bhowmik, A. Carvalho Antunes De Oliveira, R.K. Dewanjee, K. Ehataht, M. Kadastik,
M. Raidal, C. Veelken

Department of Physics, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

P. Eerola, L. Forthomme, H. Kirschenmann, K. Osterberg, M. Voutilainen

Helsinki Institute of Physics, Helsinki, Finland

F. Garcia, J. Havukainen, J.K. Heikkilä, V. Karimäki, M.S. Kim, R. Kinnunen, T. Lampén,
K. Lassila-Perini, S. Laurila, S. Lehti, T. Lindén, H. Siikonen, E. Tuominen, J. Tuominiemi

Lappeenranta University of Technology, Lappeenranta, Finland

P. Luukka, T. Tuuva

IRFU, CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

M. Besancon, F. Couderc, M. Dejardin, D. Denegri, B. Fabbro, J.L. Faure, F. Ferri,
S. Ganjour, A. Givernaud, P. Gras, G. Hamel de Monchenault, P. Jarry, C. Leloup,
B. Lenzi, E. Locci, J. Malcles, J. Rander, A. Rosowsky, M.Ö. Sahin, A. Savoy-Navarro¹³,
M. Titov, G.B. Yu

**Laboratoire Leprince-Ringuet, CNRS/IN2P3, Ecole Polytechnique, Institut
Polytechnique de Paris**

S. Ahuja, C. Amendola, F. Beaudette, P. Busson, C. Charlot, B. Diab, G. Falmagne,
R. Granier de Cassagnac, I. Kucher, A. Lobanov, C. Martin Perez, M. Nguyen, C. Ochando,
P. Paganini, J. Rembser, R. Salerno, J.B. Sauvan, Y. Sirois, A. Zabi, A. Zghiche

Université de Strasbourg, CNRS, IPHC UMR 7178, Strasbourg, France

J.-L. Agram¹⁴, J. Andrea, D. Bloch, G. Bourgatte, J.-M. Brom, E.C. Chabert, C. Collard,
E. Conte¹⁴, J.-C. Fontaine¹⁴, D. Gelé, U. Goerlach, C. Grimault, M. Jansová, A.-
C. Le Bihan, N. Tonon, P. Van Hove

**Centre de Calcul de l'Institut National de Physique Nucleaire et de Physique
des Particules, CNRS/IN2P3, Villeurbanne, France**

S. Gadrat

Université de Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS-IN2P3, Institut de Physique Nucléaire de Lyon, Villeurbanne, France

S. Beauceron, C. Bernet, G. Boudoul, C. Camen, A. Carle, N. Chanon, R. Chierici, D. Contardo, P. Depasse, H. El Mamouni, J. Fay, S. Gascon, M. Gouzevitch, B. Ille, Sa. Jain, I.B. Laktineh, H. Lattaud, A. Lesauvage, M. Lethuillier, L. Mirabito, S. Perries, V. Sordini, L. Torterotot, G. Touquet, M. Vander Donckt, S. Viret

Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia

A. Khvedelidze¹⁰

Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia

Z. Tsamalaidze¹⁰

RWTH Aachen University, I. Physikalisches Institut, Aachen, Germany

C. Autermann, L. Feld, K. Klein, M. Lipinski, D. Meuser, A. Pauls, M. Preuten, M.P. Rauch, J. Schulz, M. Teroerde

RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany

M. Erdmann, B. Fischer, S. Ghosh, T. Hebbeker, K. Hoepfner, H. Keller, L. Mastrolorenzo, M. Merschmeyer, A. Meyer, P. Millet, G. Mocellin, S. Mondal, S. Mukherjee, D. Noll, A. Novak, T. Pook, A. Pozdnyakov, T. Quast, M. Radziej, Y. Rath, H. Reithler, J. Roemer, A. Schmidt, S.C. Schuler, A. Sharma, S. Wiedenbeck, S. Zaleski

RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut B, Aachen, Germany

G. Flügge, W. Haj Ahmad¹⁵, O. Hlushchenko, T. Kress, T. Müller, A. Nowack, C. Pistone, O. Pooth, D. Roy, H. Sert, A. Stahl¹⁶

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron, Hamburg, Germany

M. Aldaya Martin, P. Asmuss, I. Babounikau, H. Bakhshiansohi, K. Beernaert, O. Behnke, A. Bermúdez Martínez, A.A. Bin Anuar, K. Borras¹⁷, V. Botta, A. Campbell, A. Cardini, P. Connor, S. Consuegra Rodríguez, C. Contreras-Campana, V. Danilov, A. De Wit, M.M. Defranchis, C. Diez Pardos, D. Domínguez Damiani, G. Eckerlin, D. Eckstein, T. Eichhorn, A. Elwood, E. Eren, E. Gallo¹⁸, A. Geiser, A. Grohsjean, M. Guthoff, M. Haranko, A. Harb, A. Jafari, N.Z. Jomhari, H. Jung, A. Kasem¹⁷, M. Kasemann, H. Kaveh, J. Keaveney, C. Kleinwort, J. Knolle, D. Krücker, W. Lange, T. Lenz, J. Lidrych, K. Lipka, W. Lohmann¹⁹, R. Mankel, I.-A. Melzer-Pellmann, A.B. Meyer, M. Meyer, M. Missiroli, J. Mnich, A. Mussgiller, V. Myronenko, D. Pérez Adán, S.K. Pflitsch, D. Pitzl, A. Raspereza, A. Saibel, M. Savitskyi, V. Scheurer, P. Schütze, C. Schwanenberger, R. Shevchenko, A. Singh, R.E. Sosa Ricardo, H. Tholen, O. Turkot, A. Vagnerini, M. Van De Klundert, R. Walsh, Y. Wen, K. Wichmann, C. Wissing, O. Zenaiev, R. Zlebcik

University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

R. Aggleton, S. Bein, L. Benato, A. Benecke, T. Dreyer, A. Ebrahimi, F. Feindt, A. Fröhlich, C. Garbers, E. Garutti, D. Gonzalez, P. Gunnellini, J. Haller, A. Hinzmänn, A. Karavdina, G. Kasieczka, R. Klanner, R. Kogler, N. Kovalchuk, S. Kurz, V. Kutzner, J. Lange, T. Lange, A. Malara, J. Multhaupt, C.E.N. Niemeyer, A. Reimers,

O. Rieger, P. Schleper, S. Schumann, J. Schwandt, J. Sonneveld, H. Stadie, G. Steinbrück, B. Vormwald, I. Zoi

Karlsruher Institut fuer Technologie, Karlsruhe, Germany

M. Akbiyik, M. Baselga, S. Baur, T. Berger, E. Butz, R. Caspart, T. Chwalek, W. De Boer, A. Dierlamm, K. El Morabit, N. Faltermann, M. Giffels, A. Gottmann, F. Hartmann¹⁶, C. Heidecker, U. Husemann, M.A. Iqbal, S. Kudella, S. Maier, S. Mitra, M.U. Mozer, D. Müller, Th. Müller, M. Musich, A. Nürnberg, G. Quast, K. Rabbertz, D. Schäfer, M. Schröder, I. Shvetsov, H.J. Simonis, R. Ulrich, M. Wassmer, M. Weber, C. Wöhrmann, R. Wolf, S. Wozniewski

Institute of Nuclear and Particle Physics (INPP), NCSR Demokritos, Aghia Paraskevi, Greece

G. Anagnostou, P. Asenov, G. Daskalakis, T. Gerasis, A. Kyriakis, D. Loukas, G. Paspalaki, A. Stakia

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece

M. Diamantopoulou, G. Karathanasis, P. Kontaxakis, A. Manousakis-katsikakis, A. Panagiotou, I. Papavergou, N. Saoulidou, K. Theofilatos, K. Vellidis, E. Vourliotis

National Technical University of Athens, Athens, Greece

G. Bakas, K. Kousouris, I. Papakrivopoulos, G. Tsipolitis, A. Zacharopoulou

University of Ioánnina, Ioánnina, Greece

I. Evangelou, C. Foudas, P. Gianneios, P. Katsoulis, P. Kokkas, S. Mallios, K. Manitaras, N. Manthos, I. Papadopoulos, J. Strologas, F.A. Triantis, D. Tsitsonis

MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary

M. Bartók²⁰, R. Chudasama, M. Csanad, P. Major, K. Mandal, A. Mehta, G. Pasztor, O. Surányi, G.I. Veres

Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary

G. Bencze, C. Hajdu, D. Horvath²¹, F. Sikler, V. Veszpremi, G. Vesztergombi[†]

Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary

N. Beni, S. Czellar, J. Karancsi²⁰, J. Molnar, Z. Szillasi

Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary

P. Raics, D. Teyssier, Z.L. Trocsanyi, B. Ujvari

Eszterhazy Karoly University, Karoly Robert Campus, Gyongyos, Hungary

T. Csorgo, W.J. Metzger, F. Nemes, T. Novak

Indian Institute of Science (IISc), Bangalore, India

S. Choudhury, J.R. Komaragiri, P.C. Tiwari

National Institute of Science Education and Research, HBNI, Bhubaneswar, India

S. Bahinipati²³, C. Kar, G. Kole, P. Mal, V.K. Muraleedharan Nair Bindhu, A. Nayak²⁴, D.K. Sahoo²³, S.K. Swain

Panjab University, Chandigarh, India

S. Bansal, S.B. Beri, V. Bhatnagar, S. Chauhan, N. Dhingra²⁵, R. Gupta, A. Kaur, M. Kaur, S. Kaur, P. Kumari, M. Lohan, M. Meena, K. Sandeep, S. Sharma, J.B. Singh, A.K. Virdi, G. Walia

University of Delhi, Delhi, India

A. Bhardwaj, B.C. Choudhary, R.B. Garg, M. Gola, S. Keshri, Ashok Kumar, M. Naimuddin, P. Priyanka, K. Ranjan, Aashaq Shah, R. Sharma

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, HBNI, Kolkata, India

R. Bhardwaj²⁶, M. Bharti²⁶, R. Bhattacharya, S. Bhattacharya, U. Bhawandeep²⁶, D. Bhowmik, S. Dutta, S. Ghosh, B. Gomber²⁷, M. Maity²⁸, K. Mondal, S. Nandan, A. Purohit, P.K. Rout, G. Saha, S. Sarkar, M. Sharan, B. Singh²⁶, S. Thakur²⁶

Indian Institute of Technology Madras, Madras, India

P.K. Behera, S.C. Behera, P. Kalbhor, A. Muhammad, P.R. Pujahari, A. Sharma, A.K. Sikdar

Bhabha Atomic Research Centre, Mumbai, India

D. Dutta, V. Jha, D.K. Mishra, P.K. Netrakanti, L.M. Pant, P. Shukla

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-A, Mumbai, India

T. Aziz, M.A. Bhat, S. Dugad, G.B. Mohanty, N. Sur, RavindraKumar Verma

Tata Institute of Fundamental Research-B, Mumbai, India

S. Banerjee, S. Bhattacharya, S. Chatterjee, P. Das, M. Guchait, S. Karmakar, S. Kumar, G. Majumder, K. Mazumdar, N. Sahoo, S. Sawant

Indian Institute of Science Education and Research (IISER), Pune, India

S. Dube, B. Kansal, A. Kapoor, K. Kothekar, S. Pandey, A. Rane, A. Rastogi, S. Sharma

Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), Tehran, Iran

S. Chenarani, S.M. Etesami, M. Khakzad, M. Mohammadi Najafabadi, M. Naseri, F. Rezaei Hosseinabadi

University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

M. Felcini, M. Grunewald

INFN Sezione di Bari^a, Università di Bari^b, Politecnico di Bari^c, Bari, Italy

M. Abbrescia^{a,b}, R. Aly^{a,b,29}, C. Calabria^{a,b}, A. Colaleo^a, D. Creanza^{a,c}, L. Cristella^{a,b}, N. De Filippis^{a,c}, M. De Palma^{a,b}, A. Di Florio^{a,b}, W. Elmetenawee^{a,b}, L. Fiore^a, A. Gelmi^{a,b}, G. Iaselli^{a,c}, M. Ince^{a,b}, S. Lezki^{a,b}, G. Maggi^{a,c}, M. Maggi^a, J.A. Merlin^a, G. Miniello^{a,b}, S. My^{a,b}, S. Nuzzo^{a,b}, A. Pompili^{a,b}, G. Pugliese^{a,c}, R. Radogna^a, A. Ranieri^a, G. Selvaggi^{a,b}, L. Silvestris^a, F.M. Simone^{a,b}, R. Venditti^a, P. Verwilligen^a

INFN Sezione di Bologna^a, Università di Bologna^b, Bologna, Italy

G. Abbiendi^a, C. Battilana^{a,b}, D. Bonacorsi^{a,b}, L. Borgonovi^{a,b}, S. Braibant-Giacomelli^{a,b}, R. Campanini^{a,b}, P. Capiluppi^{a,b}, A. Castro^{a,b}, F.R. Cavallo^a, C. Ciocca^a, G. Codispoti^{a,b}, M. Cuffiani^{a,b}, G.M. Dallavalle^a, F. Fabbri^a, A. Fanfani^{a,b}, E. Fontanesi^{a,b}, P. Giacomelli^a, C. Grandi^a, L. Guiducci^{a,b}, F. Iemmi^{a,b}, S. Lo Meo^{a,30}, S. Marcellini^a, G. Masetti^a, F.L. Navarria^{a,b}, A. Perrotta^a, F. Primavera^{a,b}, A.M. Rossi^{a,b}, T. Rovelli^{a,b}, G.P. Siroli^{a,b}, N. Tosi^a

INFN Sezione di Catania^a, Università di Catania^b, Catania, Italy

S. Albergo^{a,b,31}, S. Costa^{a,b}, A. Di Mattia^a, R. Potenza^{a,b}, A. Tricomi^{a,b,31}, C. Tuve^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Firenze^a, Università di Firenze^b, Firenze, Italy

G. Barbagli^a, A. Cassese^a, R. Ceccarelli^{a,b}, V. Ciulli^{a,b}, C. Civinini^a, R. D'Alessandro^{a,b}, F. Fiori^{a,c}, E. Focardi^{a,b}, G. Latino^{a,b}, P. Lenzi^{a,b}, M. Meschini^a, S. Paoletti^a, G. Sguazzoni^a, L. Viliani^a

INFN Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, Frascati, Italy

L. Benussi, S. Bianco, D. Piccolo

INFN Sezione di Genova^a, Università di Genova^b, Genova, Italy

M. Bozzo^{a,b}, F. Ferro^a, R. Mulargia^{a,b}, E. Robutti^a, S. Tosi^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Milano-Bicocca^a, Università di Milano-Bicocca^b, Milano, Italy

A. Benaglia^a, A. Beschi^{a,b}, F. Brivio^{a,b}, V. Ciriolo^{a,b,16}, M.E. Dinardo^{a,b}, P. Dini^a, S. Gennai^a, A. Ghezzi^{a,b}, P. Govoni^{a,b}, L. Guzzi^{a,b}, M. Malberti^a, S. Malvezzi^a, D. Menasce^a, F. Monti^{a,b}, L. Moroni^a, M. Paganoni^{a,b}, D. Pedrini^a, S. Ragazzi^{a,b}, T. Tabarelli de Fatis^{a,b}, D. Valsecchi^{a,b,16}, D. Zuolo^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Napoli^a, Università di Napoli ‘Federico II’^b, Napoli, Italy, Università della Basilicata^c, Potenza, Italy, Università G. Marconi^d, Roma, Italy

S. Buontempo^a, N. Cavallo^{a,c}, A. De Iorio^{a,b}, A. Di Crescenzo^{a,b}, F. Fabozzi^{a,c}, F. Fienga^a, G. Galati^a, A.O.M. Iorio^{a,b}, L. Layer^{a,b}, L. Lista^{a,b}, S. Meola^{a,d,16}, P. Paolucci^{a,16}, B. Rossi^a, C. Sciacca^{a,b}, E. Voevodina^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Padova^a, Università di Padova^b, Padova, Italy, Università di Trento^c, Trento, Italy

P. Azzi^a, N. Bacchetta^a, D. Bisello^{a,b}, A. Boletti^{a,b}, A. Bragagnolo^{a,b}, R. Carlin^{a,b}, P. Checchia^a, P. De Castro Manzano^a, T. Dorigo^a, U. Dosselli^a, F. Gasparini^{a,b}, U. Gasparini^{a,b}, A. Gozzelino^a, S.Y. Hoh^{a,b}, M. Margoni^{a,b}, A.T. Meneguzzo^{a,b}, J. Pazzini^{a,b}, M. Presilla^b, P. Ronchese^{a,b}, R. Rossin^{a,b}, F. Simonetto^{a,b}, A. Tiko^a, M. Tosi^{a,b}, M. Zanetti^{a,b}, P. Zotto^{a,b}, A. Zucchetta^{a,b}, G. Zumerle^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Pavia^a, Università di Pavia^b, Pavia, Italy

A. Braghieri^a, D. Fiorina^{a,b}, P. Montagna^{a,b}, S.P. Ratti^{a,b}, V. Re^a, M. Ressegotti^{a,b}, C. Riccardi^{a,b}, P. Salvini^a, I. Vai^a, P. Vitulo^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Perugia^a, Università di Perugia^b, Perugia, Italy

M. Biasini^{a,b}, G.M. Bilei^a, D. Ciangottini^{a,b}, L. Fanò^{a,b}, P. Lariccia^{a,b}, R. Leonardi^{a,b},
E. Manoni^a, G. Mantovani^{a,b}, V. Mariani^{a,b}, M. Menichelli^a, A. Rossi^{a,b}, A. Santocchia^{a,b},
D. Spiga^a

INFN Sezione di Pisa^a, Università di Pisa^b, Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa^c, Pisa, Italy

K. Androsov^a, P. Azzurri^a, G. Bagliesi^a, V. Bertacchi^{a,c}, L. Bianchini^a, T. Boccali^a,
R. Castaldi^a, M.A. Ciocci^{a,b}, R. Dell’Orso^a, S. Donato^a, L. Giannini^{a,c}, A. Giassi^a,
M.T. Grippo^a, F. Ligabue^{a,c}, E. Manca^{a,c}, G. Mandorli^{a,c}, A. Messineo^{a,b}, F. Palla^a,
A. Rizzi^{a,b}, G. Rolandi^{a,c}, S. Roy Chowdhury^{a,c}, A. Scribano^a, P. Spagnolo^a, R. Tenchini^a,
G. Tonelli^{a,b}, N. Turini^a, A. Venturi^a, P.G. Verdini^a

INFN Sezione di Roma^a, Sapienza Università di Roma^b, Rome, Italy

F. Cavallari^a, M. Cipriani^{a,b}, D. Del Re^{a,b}, E. Di Marco^a, M. Diemoz^a, E. Longo^{a,b},
P. Meridiani^a, G. Organtini^{a,b}, F. Pandolfi^a, R. Paramatti^{a,b}, C. Quaranta^{a,b},
S. Rahatlou^{a,b}, C. Rovelli^a, F. Santanastasio^{a,b}, L. Soffi^{a,b}, R. Tramontano^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Torino^a, Università di Torino^b, Torino, Italy, Università del Piemonte Orientale^c, Novara, Italy

N. Amapane^{a,b}, R. Arcidiacono^{a,c}, S. Argiro^{a,b}, M. Arneodo^{a,c}, N. Bartosik^a,
R. Bellan^{a,b}, A. Bellora^{a,b}, C. Biino^a, A. Cappati^{a,b}, N. Cartiglia^a, S. Cometti^a,
M. Costa^{a,b}, R. Covarelli^{a,b}, N. Demaria^a, J.R. González Fernández^a, B. Kiani^{a,b},
F. Legger^a, C. Mariotti^a, S. Maselli^a, E. Migliore^{a,b}, V. Monaco^{a,b}, E. Monteil^{a,b},
M. Monteno^a, M.M. Obertino^{a,b}, G. Ortona^a, L. Pacher^{a,b}, N. Pastrone^a, M. Pelliccioni^a,
G.L. Pinna Angioni^{a,b}, A. Romero^{a,b}, M. Ruspà^{a,c}, R. Salvatico^{a,b}, V. Sola^a, A. Solano^{a,b},
D. Soldi^{a,b}, A. Staiano^a, D. Trocino^{a,b}

INFN Sezione di Trieste^a, Università di Trieste^b, Trieste, Italy

S. Belforte^a, V. Candelise^{a,b}, M. Casarsa^a, F. Cossutti^a, A. Da Rold^{a,b}, G. Della Ricca^{a,b},
F. Vazzoler^{a,b}, A. Zanetti^a

Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea

B. Kim, D.H. Kim, G.N. Kim, J. Lee, S.W. Lee, C.S. Moon, Y.D. Oh, S.I. Pak, S. Sekmen,
D.C. Son, Y.C. Yang

Chonnam National University, Institute for Universe and Elementary Particles, Kwangju, Korea

H. Kim, D.H. Moon

Hanyang University, Seoul, Korea

B. Francois, T.J. Kim, J. Park

Korea University, Seoul, Korea

S. Cho, S. Choi, Y. Go, S. Ha, B. Hong, K. Lee, K.S. Lee, J. Lim, J. Park, S.K. Park,
Y. Roh, J. Yoo

Kyung Hee University, Department of Physics

J. Goh

Sejong University, Seoul, Korea

H.S. Kim

Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea

J. Almond, J.H. Bhyun, J. Choi, S. Jeon, J. Kim, J.S. Kim, H. Lee, K. Lee, S. Lee, K. Nam, M. Oh, S.B. Oh, B.C. Radburn-Smith, U.K. Yang, H.D. Yoo, I. Yoon

University of Seoul, Seoul, Korea

D. Jeon, J.H. Kim, J.S.H. Lee, I.C. Park, I.J. Watson

Sungkyunkwan University, Suwon, Korea

Y. Choi, C. Hwang, Y. Jeong, J. Lee, Y. Lee, I. Yu

Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia

V. Veckalns³²

Vilnius University, Vilnius, Lithuania

V. Dudenas, A. Juodagalvis, A. Rinkevicius, G. Tamulaitis, J. Vaitkus

National Centre for Particle Physics, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

F. Mohamad Idris³³, W.A.T. Wan Abdullah, M.N. Yusli, Z. Zolkapli

Universidad de Sonora (UNISON), Hermosillo, Mexico

J.F. Benitez, A. Castaneda Hernandez, J.A. Murillo Quijada, L. Valencia Palomo

Centro de Investigacion y de Estudios Avanzados del IPN, Mexico City, Mexico

H. Castilla-Valdez, E. De La Cruz-Burelo, I. Heredia-De La Cruz³⁴, R. Lopez-Fernandez, A. Sanchez-Hernandez

Universidad Iberoamericana, Mexico City, Mexico

S. Carrillo Moreno, C. Oropeza Barrera, M. Ramirez-Garcia, F. Vazquez Valencia

Benemerita Universidad Autonoma de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico

J. Eysermans, I. Pedraza, H.A. Salazar Ibarguen, C. Uribe Estrada

Universidad Autónoma de San Luis Potosí, San Luis Potosí, Mexico

A. Morelos Pineda

University of Montenegro, Podgorica, Montenegro

J. Mijuskovic², N. Raicevic

University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

D. Krofcheck

University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand

S. Bheesette, P.H. Butler, P. Lujan

National Centre for Physics, Quaid-I-Azam University, Islamabad, Pakistan

A. Ahmad, M. Ahmad, M.I.M. Awan, Q. Hassan, H.R. Hoorani, W.A. Khan, M.A. Shah, M. Shoaib, M. Waqas

AGH University of Science and Technology Faculty of Computer Science, Electronics and Telecommunications, Krakow, Poland

V. Avati, L. Grzanka, M. Malawski

National Centre for Nuclear Research, Swierk, Poland

H. Bialkowska, M. Bluj, B. Boimska, M. Górski, M. Kazana, M. Szeleper, P. Zalewski

Institute of Experimental Physics, Faculty of Physics, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland

K. Bunkowski, A. Byszuk³⁵, K. Doroba, A. Kalinowski, M. Konecki, J. Krolikowski, M. Olszewski, M. Walczak

Laboratório de Instrumentação e Física Experimental de Partículas, Lisboa, Portugal

M. Araujo, P. Bargassa, D. Bastos, A. Di Francesco, P. Faccioli, B. Galinhas, M. Gallinaro, J. Hollar, N. Leonardo, T. Niknejad, J. Seixas, K. Shchelina, G. Strong, O. Toldaiev, J. Varela

Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia

S. Afanasiev, P. Bunin, M. Gavrilenko, I. Golutvin, N. Gorbounov, I. Gorbunov, A. Kamenev, V. Karjavine, I. Kashunin, V. Korenkov, A. Lanev, A. Malakhov, V. Matveev^{36,37}, V.V. Mitsyn, P. Moiseenz, V. Palichik, V. Pereygin, S. Shmatov, V. Trofimov, A. Zarubin

Petersburg Nuclear Physics Institute, Gatchina (St. Petersburg), Russia

L. Chtchipounov, V. Golovtcov, Y. Ivanov, V. Kim³⁸, E. Kuznetsova³⁹, P. Levchenko, V. Murzin, V. Oreshkin, I. Smirnov, D. Sosnov, V. Sulimov, L. Uvarov, A. Vorobyev

Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia

Yu. Andreev, A. Dermenev, S. Gninenko, N. Golubev, A. Karneyeu, M. Kirsanov, N. Krasnikov, A. Pashenkov, D. Tlisov, A. Toropin

Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics named by A.I. Alikhanov of NRC ‘Kurchatov Institute’, Moscow, Russia

V. Epshteyn, V. Gavrilov, N. Lychkovskaya, A. Nikitenko⁴⁰, V. Popov, I. Pozdnyakov, G. Safronov, A. Spiridonov, A. Stepenov, M. Toms, E. Vlasov, A. Zhokin

Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Moscow, Russia

T. Aushev

National Research Nuclear University ‘Moscow Engineering Physics Institute’ (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia

M. Chadeeva⁴¹, P. Parygin, D. Philippov, E. Popova, V. Rusinov

P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia

V. Andreev, M. Azarkin, I. Dremin, M. Kirakosyan, A. Terkulov

Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

A. Belyaev, E. Boos, A. Demiyanov, A. Ershov, A. Gribushin, O. Kodolova, V. Korotkikh, I. Lokhtin, S. Obraztsov, S. Petrushanko, V. Savrin, A. Snigirev, I. Vardanyan

Novosibirsk State University (NSU), Novosibirsk, Russia

A. Barnyakov⁴², V. Blinov⁴², T. Dimova⁴², L. Kardapoltsev⁴², Y. Skovpen⁴²

Institute for High Energy Physics of National Research Centre ‘Kurchatov Institute’, Protvino, Russia

I. Azhgirey, I. Bayshev, S. Bitioukov, V. Kachanov, D. Konstantinov, P. Mandrik, V. Petrov, R. Ryutin, S. Slabospitskii, A. Sobol, S. Troshin, N. Tyurin, A. Uzunian, A. Volkov

National Research Tomsk Polytechnic University, Tomsk, Russia

A. Babaev, A. Iuzhakov, V. Okhotnikov

Tomsk State University, Tomsk, Russia

V. Borchsh, V. Ivanchenko, E. Tcherniaev

University of Belgrade: Faculty of Physics and VINCA Institute of Nuclear Sciences

P. Adzic⁴³, P. Cirkovic, M. Dordevic, P. Milenovic, J. Milosevic, M. Stojanovic

Centro de Investigaciones Energéticas Medioambientales y Tecnológicas (CIEMAT), Madrid, Spain

M. Aguilar-Benitez, J. Alcaraz Maestre, A. Álvarez Fernández, I. Bachiller, M. Barrio Luna, CristinaF. Bedoya, J.A. Brochero Cifuentes, C.A. Carrillo Montoya, M. Cepeda, M. Cerrada, N. Colino, B. De La Cruz, A. Delgado Peris, J.P. Fernández Ramos, J. Flix, M.C. Fouz, O. Gonzalez Lopez, S. Goy Lopez, J.M. Hernandez, M.I. Josa, D. Moran, Á. Navarro Tobar, A. Pérez-Calero Yzquierdo, J. Puerta Pelayo, I. Redondo, L. Romero, S. Sánchez Navas, M.S. Soares, A. Triossi, C. Willmott

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

C. Albajar, J.F. de Trocóniz, R. Reyes-Almanza

Universidad de Oviedo, Instituto Universitario de Ciencias y Tecnologías Espaciales de Asturias (ICTEA), Oviedo, Spain

B. Alvarez Gonzalez, J. Cuevas, C. Erice, J. Fernandez Menendez, S. Folgueras, I. Gonzalez Caballero, E. Palencia Cortezon, C. Ramón Álvarez, V. Rodríguez Bouza, S. Sanchez Cruz

Instituto de Física de Cantabria (IFCA), CSIC-Universidad de Cantabria, Santander, Spain

I.J. Cabrillo, A. Calderon, B. Chazin Quero, J. Duarte Campderros, M. Fernandez, P.J. Fernández Manteca, A. García Alonso, G. Gomez, C. Martinez Rivero, P. Mar-

tinez Ruiz del Arbol, F. Matorras, J. Piedra Gomez, C. Prieels, F. Ricci-Tam, T. Rodrigo, A. Ruiz-Jimeno, L. Russo⁴⁴, L. Scodellaro, I. Vila, J.M. Vizan Garcia

University of Colombo, Colombo, Sri Lanka

D.U.J. Sonnadara

University of Ruhuna, Department of Physics, Matara, Sri Lanka

W.G.D. Dharmaratna, N. Wickramage

CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland

T.K. Aarrestad, D. Abbaneo, B. Akgun, E. Auffray, G. Auzinger, J. Baechler, P. Baillon, A.H. Ball, D. Barney, J. Bendavid, M. Bianco, A. Bocci, P. Bortignon, E. Bossini, E. Brondolin, T. Camporesi, A. Caratelli, G. Cerminara, E. Chapon, G. Cucciati, D. d'Enterria, A. Dabrowski, N. Daci, V. Daponte, A. David, O. Davignon, A. De Roeck, M. Deile, R. Di Maria, M. Dobson, M. Dünser, N. Dupont, A. Elliott-Peisert, N. Emriskova, F. Fallavollita⁴⁵, D. Fasanella, S. Fiorendi, G. Franzoni, J. Fulcher, W. Funk, S. Giani, D. Gigi, K. Gill, F. Glege, L. Gouskos, M. Gruchala, M. Guilbaud, D. Gulhan, J. Hegeman, C. Heidegger, Y. Iiyama, V. Innocente, T. James, P. Janot, O. Karacheban¹⁹, J. Kaspar, J. Kieseler, M. Krammer¹, N. Kratochwil, C. Lange, P. Lecoq, K. Long, C. Lourenço, L. Malgeri, M. Mannelli, A. Massironi, F. Meijers, S. Mersi, E. Meschi, F. Moortgat, M. Mulders, J. Ngadiuba, J. Niedziela, S. Nourbakhsh, S. Orfanelli, L. Orsini, F. Pantaleo¹⁶, L. Pape, E. Perez, M. Peruzzi, A. Petrilli, G. Petrucciani, A. Pfeiffer, M. Pierini, F.M. Pitters, D. Rabady, A. Racz, M. Rieger, M. Rovere, H. Sakulin, J. Salfeld-Nebgen, S. Scarfi, C. Schäfer, C. Schwick, M. Selvaggi, A. Sharma, P. Silva, W. Snoeys, P. Sphicas⁴⁶, J. Steggemann, S. Summers, V.R. Tavolaro, D. Treille, A. Tsirou, G.P. Van Onsem, A. Vartak, M. Verzetti, K.A. Wozniak, W.D. Zeuner

Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen, Switzerland

L. Caminada⁴⁷, K. Deiters, W. Erdmann, R. Horisberger, Q. Ingram, H.C. Kaestli, D. Kotlinski, U. Langenegger, T. Rohe

ETH Zurich — Institute for Particle Physics and Astrophysics (IPA), Zurich, Switzerland

M. Backhaus, P. Berger, N. Chernyavskaya, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Donegà, C. Dorfer, T.A. Gómez Espinosa, C. Grab, D. Hits, W. Lustermann, R.A. Manzoni, M.T. Meinhard, F. Micheli, P. Musella, F. Nessi-Tedaldi, F. Pauss, V. Perovic, G. Perrin, L. Perrozzi, S. Pigazzini, M.G. Ratti, M. Reichmann, C. Reissel, T. Reitenspiess, B. Ristic, D. Ruini, D.A. Sanz Becerra, M. Schönenberger, L. Shchutska, M.L. Vesterbacka Olsson, R. Wallny, D.H. Zhu

Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland

C. AMSler⁴⁸, C. Botta, D. Brzhechko, M.F. Canelli, A. De Cosa, R. Del Burgo, B. Kilminster, S. Leontsinis, V.M. Mikuni, I. Neutelings, G. Rauco, P. Robmann, K. Schweiger, Y. Takahashi, S. Wertz

National Central University, Chung-Li, Taiwan

C.M. Kuo, W. Lin, A. Roy, T. Sarkar²⁸, S.S. Yu

National Taiwan University (NTU), Taipei, Taiwan

P. Chang, Y. Chao, K.F. Chen, P.H. Chen, W.-S. Hou, Y.y. Li, R.-S. Lu, E. Paganis, A. Psallidas, A. Steen

Chulalongkorn University, Faculty of Science, Department of Physics, Bangkok, Thailand

B. Asavapibhop, C. Asawatangtrakuldee, N. Srimanobhas, N. Suwonjandee

Çukurova University, Physics Department, Science and Art Faculty, Adana, Turkey

A. Bat, F. Boran, A. Celik⁴⁹, S. Damarseckin⁵⁰, Z.S. Demiroglu, F. Dolek, C. Dozen⁵¹, I. Dumanoglu⁵², G. Gokbulut, EmineGurpinar Guler⁵³, Y. Guler, I. Hos⁵⁴, C. Isik, E.E. Kangal⁵⁵, O. Kara, A. Kayis Topaksu, U. Kiminsu, G. Onengut, K. Ozdemir⁵⁶, S. Ozturk⁵⁷, A.E. Simsek, U.G. Tok, S. Turkcapar, I.S. Zorbakir, C. Zorbilmez

Middle East Technical University, Physics Department, Ankara, Turkey

B. Isildak⁵⁸, G. Karapinar⁵⁹, M. Yalvac⁶⁰

Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey

I.O. Atakisi, E. Gülmez, M. Kaya⁶¹, O. Kaya⁶², Ö. Özçelik, S. Tekten⁶², E.A. Yetkin⁶³

Istanbul Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey

A. Cakir, K. Cankocak⁵², Y. Komurcu, S. Sen⁶⁴

Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey

S. Cerci⁶⁵, B. Kaynak, S. Ozkorucuklu, D. Sunar Cerci⁶⁵

Institute for Scintillation Materials of National Academy of Science of Ukraine, Kharkov, Ukraine

B. Grynyov

National Scientific Center, Kharkov Institute of Physics and Technology, Kharkov, Ukraine

L. Levchuk

University of Bristol, Bristol, United Kingdom

E. Bhal, S. Bologna, J.J. Brooke, D. Burns⁶⁶, E. Clement, D. Cussans, H. Flacher, J. Goldstein, G.P. Heath, H.F. Heath, L. Kreczko, B. Krikler, S. Paramesvaran, T. Sakuma, S. Seif El Nasr-Storey, V.J. Smith, J. Taylor, A. Titterton

Rutherford Appleton Laboratory, Didcot, United Kingdom

K.W. Bell, A. Belyaev⁶⁷, C. Brew, R.M. Brown, D.J.A. Cockerill, J.A. Coughlan, K. Harder, S. Harper, J. Linacre, K. Manolopoulos, D.M. Newbold, E. Olaiya, D. Petyt, T. Reis, T. Schuh, C.H. Shepherd-Themistocleous, A. Thea, I.R. Tomalin, T. Williams

Imperial College, London, United Kingdom

R. Bainbridge, P. Bloch, S. Bonomally, J. Borg, S. Breeze, O. Buchmuller, A. Bundock, GurpreetSingh CHAHAL⁶⁸, D. Colling, P. Dauncey, G. Davies, M. Della Negra, P. Everaerts, G. Hall, G. Iles, M. Komm, L. Lyons, A.-M. Magnan, S. Malik, A. Martelli,

V. Milosevic, A. Morton, J. Nash⁶⁹, V. Palladino, M. Pesaresi, D.M. Raymond, A. Richards, A. Rose, E. Scott, C. Seez, A. Shtipliyski, M. Stoye, T. Strebler, A. Tapper, K. Uchida, T. Virdee¹⁶, N. Wardle, S.N. Webb, D. Winterbottom, A.G. Zecchinelli, S.C. Zenz

Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom

J.E. Cole, P.R. Hobson, A. Khan, P. Kyberd, C.K. Mackay, I.D. Reid, L. Teodorescu, S. Zahid

Baylor University, Waco, U.S.A.

A. Brinkerhoff, K. Call, B. Caraway, J. Dittmann, K. Hatakeyama, C. Madrid, B. McMaster, N. Pastika, C. Smith

Catholic University of America, Washington, DC, U.S.A.

R. Bartek, A. Dominguez, R. Uniyal, A.M. Vargas Hernandez

The University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, U.S.A.

A. Buccilli, S.I. Cooper, S.V. Gleyzer, C. Henderson, P. Rumerio, C. West

Boston University, Boston, U.S.A.

A. Albert, D. Arcaro, Z. Demiragli, D. Gastler, C. Richardson, J. Rohlf, D. Sperka, D. Spitzbart, I. Suarez, L. Sulak, D. Zou

Brown University, Providence, U.S.A.

G. Benelli, B. Burkle, X. Coubez¹⁷, D. Cutts, Y.t. Duh, M. Hadley, U. Heintz, J.M. Hogan⁷⁰, K.H.M. Kwok, E. Laird, G. Landsberg, K.T. Lau, J. Lee, M. Narain, S. Sagir⁷¹, R. Syarif, E. Usai, W.Y. Wong, D. Yu, W. Zhang

University of California, Davis, Davis, U.S.A.

R. Band, C. Brainerd, R. Breedon, M. Calderon De La Barca Sanchez, M. Chertok, J. Conway, R. Conway, P.T. Cox, R. Erbacher, C. Flores, G. Funk, F. Jensen, W. Ko[†], O. Kukral, R. Lander, M. Mulhearn, D. Pellett, J. Pilot, M. Shi, D. Taylor, K. Tos, M. Tripathi, Z. Wang, F. Zhang

University of California, Los Angeles, U.S.A.

M. Bachtis, C. Bravo, R. Cousins, A. Dasgupta, A. Florent, J. Hauser, M. Ignatenko, N. Mccoll, W.A. Nash, S. Regnard, D. Saltzberg, C. Schnaible, B. Stone, V. Valuev

University of California, Riverside, Riverside, U.S.A.

K. Burt, Y. Chen, R. Clare, J.W. Gary, S.M.A. Ghiasi Shirazi, G. Hanson, G. Karapostoli, O.R. Long, N. Manganelli, M. Olmedo Negrete, M.I. Paneva, W. Si, S. Wimpenny, B.R. Yates, Y. Zhang

University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, U.S.A.

J.G. Branson, P. Chang, S. Cittolin, S. Cooperstein, N. Deelen, M. Derdzinski, J. Duarte, R. Gerosa, D. Gilbert, B. Hashemi, D. Klein, V. Krutelyov, J. Letts, M. Masciovecchio, S. May, S. Padhi, M. Pieri, V. Sharma, M. Tadel, F. Würthwein, A. Yagil, G. Zevi Della Porta

University of California, Santa Barbara — Department of Physics, Santa Barbara, U.S.A.

N. Amin, R. Bhandari, C. Campagnari, M. Citron, V. Dutta, J. Incandela, B. Marsh, H. Mei, A. Ovcharova, H. Qu, J. Richman, U. Sarica, D. Stuart, S. Wang

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, U.S.A.

D. Anderson, A. Bornheim, O. Cerri, I. Dutta, J.M. Lawhorn, N. Lu, J. Mao, H.B. Newman, T.Q. Nguyen, J. Pata, M. Spiropulu, J.R. Vlimant, S. Xie, Z. Zhang, R.Y. Zhu

Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, U.S.A.

J. Alison, M.B. Andrews, T. Ferguson, T. Mudholkar, M. Paulini, M. Sun, I. Vorobiev, M. Weinberg

University of Colorado Boulder, Boulder, U.S.A.

J.P. Cumalat, W.T. Ford, E. MacDonald, T. Mulholland, R. Patel, A. Perloff, K. Stenson, K.A. Ulmer, S.R. Wagner

Cornell University, Ithaca, U.S.A.

J. Alexander, Y. Cheng, J. Chu, A. Datta, A. Frankenthal, K. Mcdermott, J.R. Patterson, D. Quach, A. Ryd, S.M. Tan, Z. Tao, J. Thom, P. Wittich, M. Zientek

Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, Batavia, U.S.A.

S. Abdullin, M. Albrow, M. Alyari, G. Apollinari, A. Apresyan, A. Apyan, S. Banerjee, L.A.T. Bauerdick, A. Beretvas, D. Berry, J. Berryhill, P.C. Bhat, K. Burkett, J.N. Butler, A. Canepa, G.B. Cerati, H.W.K. Cheung, F. Chlebana, M. Cremonesi, V.D. Elvira, J. Freeman, Z. Gecse, E. Gottschalk, L. Gray, D. Green, S. Grünendahl, O. Gutsche, J. Hanlon, R.M. Harris, S. Hasegawa, R. Heller, J. Hirschauer, B. Jayatilaka, S. Jindariani, M. Johnson, U. Joshi, T. Klijnsma, B. Klima, M.J. Kortelainen, B. Kreis, S. Lammel, J. Lewis, D. Lincoln, R. Lipton, M. Liu, T. Liu, J. Lykken, K. Maeshima, J.M. Marraffino, D. Mason, P. McBride, P. Merkel, S. Mrenna, S. Nahn, V. O'Dell, V. Papadimitriou, K. Pedro, C. Pena⁷², F. Ravera, A. Reinsvold Hall, L. Ristori, B. Schneider, E. Sexton-Kennedy, N. Smith, A. Soha, W.J. Spalding, L. Spiegel, S. Stoynev, J. Strait, L. Taylor, S. Tkaczyk, N.V. Tran, L. Uplegger, E.W. Vaandering, C. Vernieri, R. Vidal, M. Wang, H.A. Weber, A. Woodard

University of Florida, Gainesville, U.S.A.

D. Acosta, P. Avery, D. Bourilkov, L. Cadamuro, V. Cherepanov, F. Errico, R.D. Field, D. Guerrero, B.M. Joshi, M. Kim, J. Konigsberg, A. Korytov, K.H. Lo, K. Matchev, N. Menendez, G. Mitselmakher, D. Rosenzweig, K. Shi, J. Wang, S. Wang, X. Zuo

Florida International University, Miami, U.S.A.

Y.R. Joshi

Florida State University, Tallahassee, U.S.A.

T. Adams, A. Askew, S. Hagopian, V. Hagopian, K.F. Johnson, R. Khurana, T. Kolberg, G. Martinez, T. Perry, H. Prosper, C. Schiber, R. Yohay, J. Zhang

Florida Institute of Technology, Melbourne, U.S.A.

M.M. Baarmand, M. Hohlmann, D. Noonan, M. Rahmani, M. Saunders, F. Yumiceva

University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), Chicago, U.S.A.

M.R. Adams, L. Apanasevich, R.R. Betts, R. Cavanaugh, X. Chen, S. Dittmer, O. Evdokimov, C.E. Gerber, D.A. Hangal, D.J. Hofman, V. Kumar, C. Mills, G. Oh, T. Roy, M.B. Tonjes, N. Varelas, J. Viinikainen, H. Wang, X. Wang, Z. Wu

The University of Iowa, Iowa City, U.S.A.

M. Alhusseini, B. Bilki⁵³, K. Dilsiz⁷³, S. Durgut, R.P. Gandrajula, M. Haytmyradov, V. Khristenko, O.K. Köseyan, J.-P. Merlo, A. Mestvirishvili⁷⁴, A. Moeller, J. Nachtman, H. Ogul⁷⁵, Y. Onel, F. Ozok⁷⁶, A. Penzo, C. Snyder, E. Tiras, J. Wetzel, K. Yi⁷⁷

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, U.S.A.

B. Blumenfeld, A. Cocoros, N. Eminizer, A.V. Gritsan, W.T. Hung, S. Kyriacou, P. Maksimovic, C. Mantilla, J. Roskes, M. Swartz, T.Á. Vámi

The University of Kansas, Lawrence, U.S.A.

C. Baldenegro Barrera, P. Baringer, A. Bean, S. Boren, A. Bylinkin, T. Isidori, S. Khalil, J. King, G. Krintiras, A. Kropivnitskaya, C. Lindsey, D. Majumder, W. Mcbrayer, N. Minafra, M. Murray, C. Rogan, C. Royon, S. Sanders, E. Schmitz, J.D. Tapia Takaki, Q. Wang, J. Williams, G. Wilson

Kansas State University, Manhattan, U.S.A.

S. Duric, A. Ivanov, K. Kaadze, D. Kim, Y. Maravin, D.R. Mendis, T. Mitchell, A. Modak, A. Mohammadi

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, U.S.A.

F. Rebassoo, D. Wright

University of Maryland, College Park, U.S.A.

A. Baden, O. Baron, A. Belloni, S.C. Eno, Y. Feng, N.J. Hadley, S. Jabeen, G.Y. Jeng, R.G. Kellogg, A.C. Mignerey, S. Nabili, M. Seidel, Y.H. Shin, A. Skuja, S.C. Tonwar, L. Wang, K. Wong

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, U.S.A.

D. Abercrombie, B. Allen, R. Bi, S. Brandt, W. Busza, I.A. Cali, M. D'Alfonso, G. Gomez Ceballos, M. Goncharov, P. Harris, D. Hsu, M. Hu, M. Klute, D. Kovalskyi, Y.-J. Lee, P.D. Luckey, B. Maier, A.C. Marini, C. McGinn, C. Mironov, S. Narayanan, X. Niu, C. Paus, D. Rankin, C. Roland, G. Roland, Z. Shi, G.S.F. Stephans, K. Sumorok, K. Tatar, D. Velicanu, J. Wang, T.W. Wang, B. Wyslouch

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, U.S.A.

R.M. Chatterjee, A. Evans, S. Guts[†], P. Hansen, J. Hiltbrand, Sh. Jain, Y. Kubota, Z. Lesko, J. Mans, M. Revering, R. Rusack, R. Saradhy, N. Schroeder, N. Strobbe, M.A. Wadud

University of Mississippi, Oxford, U.S.A.

J.G. Acosta, S. Oliveros

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, U.S.A.

K. Bloom, S. Chauhan, D.R. Claes, C. Fangmeier, L. Finco, F. Golf, R. Kamalieddin, I. Kravchenko, J.E. Siado, G.R. Snow[†], B. Stieger, W. Tabb

State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, U.S.A.

G. Agarwal, C. Harrington, I. Iashvili, A. Kharchilava, C. McLean, D. Nguyen, A. Parker, J. Pekkanen, S. Rappoccio, B. Roozbahani

Northeastern University, Boston, U.S.A.

G. Alverson, E. Barberis, C. Freer, Y. Haddad, A. Hortiangtham, G. Madigan, B. Marzocchi, D.M. Morse, T. Orimoto, L. Skinnari, A. Tishelman-Charny, T. Wamorkar, B. Wang, A. Wisecarver, D. Wood

Northwestern University, Evanston, U.S.A.

S. Bhattacharya, J. Bueghly, G. Fedi, A. Gilbert, T. Gunter, K.A. Hahn, N. Odell, M.H. Schmitt, K. Sung, M. Velasco

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, U.S.A.

R. Bucci, N. Dev, R. Goldouzian, M. Hildreth, K. Hurtado Anampa, C. Jessop, D.J. Karmgard, K. Lannon, W. Li, N. Loukas, N. Marinelli, I. Mcalister, F. Meng, Y. Musienko³⁶, R. Ruchti, P. Siddireddy, G. Smith, S. Taroni, M. Wayne, A. Wightman, M. Wolf

The Ohio State University, Columbus, U.S.A.

J. Alimena, B. Bylsma, L.S. Durkin, B. Francis, C. Hill, W. Ji, A. Lefeld, T.Y. Ling, B.L. Winer

Princeton University, Princeton, U.S.A.

G. Dezoort, P. Elmer, J. Hardenbrook, N. Haubrich, S. Higginbotham, A. Kalogeropoulos, S. Kwan, D. Lange, M.T. Lucchini, J. Luo, D. Marlow, K. Mei, I. Ojalvo, J. Olsen, C. Palmer, P. Piroué, D. Stickland, C. Tully

University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez, U.S.A.

S. Malik, S. Norberg

Purdue University, West Lafayette, U.S.A.

A. Barker, V.E. Barnes, R. Chawla, S. Das, L. Gutay, M. Jones, A.W. Jung, B. Mahakud, D.H. Miller, G. Negro, N. Neumeister, C.C. Peng, S. Piperov, H. Qiu, J.F. Schulte, N. Trevisani, F. Wang, R. Xiao, W. Xie

Purdue University Northwest, Hammond, U.S.A.

T. Cheng, J. Dolen, N. Parashar

Rice University, Houston, U.S.A.

A. Baty, U. Behrens, S. Dildick, K.M. Ecklund, S. Freed, F.J.M. Geurts, M. Kilpatrick, Arun Kumar, W. Li, B.P. Padley, R. Redjimi, J. Roberts, J. Rorie, W. Shi, A.G. Stahl Leiton, Z. Tu, A. Zhang

University of Rochester, Rochester, U.S.A.

A. Bodek, P. de Barbaro, R. Demina, J.L. Dulemba, C. Fallon, T. Ferbel, M. Galanti, A. Garcia-Bellido, O. Hindrichs, A. Khukhunaishvili, E. Ranken, R. Taus

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Piscataway, U.S.A.

B. Chiarito, J.P. Chou, A. Gandrakota, Y. Gershtein, E. Halkiadakis, A. Hart, M. Heindl, E. Hughes, S. Kaplan, I. Laflotte, A. Lath, R. Montalvo, K. Nash, M. Osherson, S. Salur, S. Schnetzer, S. Somalwar, R. Stone, S. Thomas

University of Tennessee, Knoxville, U.S.A.

H. Acharya, A.G. Delannoy, S. Spanier

Texas A&M University, College Station, U.S.A.

O. Bouhali⁷⁸, M. Dalchenko, M. De Mattia, A. Delgado, R. Eusebi, J. Gilmore, T. Huang, T. Kamon⁷⁹, H. Kim, S. Luo, S. Malhotra, D. Marley, R. Mueller, D. Overton, L. Perniè, D. Rathjens, A. Safonov

Texas Tech University, Lubbock, U.S.A.

N. Akchurin, J. Damgov, F. De Guio, V. Hegde, S. Kunori, K. Lamichhane, S.W. Lee, T. Mengke, S. Muthumuni, T. Peltola, S. Undleeb, I. Volobouev, Z. Wang, A. Whitbeck

Vanderbilt University, Nashville, U.S.A.

S. Greene, A. Gurrola, R. Janjam, W. Johns, C. Maguire, A. Melo, H. Ni, K. Padeken, F. Romeo, P. Sheldon, S. Tuo, J. Velkovska, M. Verweij

University of Virginia, Charlottesville, U.S.A.

M.W. Arenton, P. Barria, B. Cox, G. Cummings, J. Hakala, R. Hirosky, M. Joyce, A. Ledovskoy, C. Neu, B. Tannenwald, Y. Wang, E. Wolfe, F. Xia

Wayne State University, Detroit, U.S.A.

R. Harr, P.E. Karchin, N. Poudyal, J. Sturdy, P. Thapa

University of Wisconsin — Madison, Madison, WI, U.S.A.

K. Black, T. Bose, J. Buchanan, C. Caillol, D. Carlsmith, S. Dasu, I. De Bruyn, L. Dodd, C. Galloni, H. He, M. Herndon, A. Hervé, U. Hussain, A. Lanaro, A. Loeliger, R. Loveless, J. Madhusudanan Sreekala, A. Mallampalli, D. Pinna, T. Ruggles, A. Savin, V. Sharma, W.H. Smith, D. Teague, S. Trembath-reichert

†: Deceased

1: Also at Vienna University of Technology, Vienna, Austria

2: Also at IRFU, CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, Gif-sur-Yvette, France

3: Also at Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, Brazil

4: Also at Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre, Brazil

5: Also at UFMS, Nova Andradina, Brazil

6: Also at Universidade Federal de Pelotas, Pelotas, Brazil

7: Also at Université Libre de Bruxelles, Bruxelles, Belgium

8: Also at University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

- 9: Also at Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics named by A.I. Alikhanov of NRC ‘Kurchatov Institute’, Moscow, Russia
- 10: Also at Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia
- 11: Also at Fayoum University, El-Fayoum, Egypt
- 12: Now at British University in Egypt, Cairo, Egypt
- 13: Also at Purdue University, West Lafayette, U.S.A.
- 14: Also at Université de Haute Alsace, Mulhouse, France
- 15: Also at Erzincan Binali Yildirim University, Erzincan, Turkey
- 16: Also at CERN, European Organization for Nuclear Research, Geneva, Switzerland
- 17: Also at RWTH Aachen University, III. Physikalisches Institut A, Aachen, Germany
- 18: Also at University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany
- 19: Also at Brandenburg University of Technology, Cottbus, Germany
- 20: Also at Institute of Physics, University of Debrecen, Debrecen, Hungary, Debrecen, Hungary
- 21: Also at Institute of Nuclear Research ATOMKI, Debrecen, Hungary
- 22: Also at MTA-ELTE Lendület CMS Particle and Nuclear Physics Group, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary, Budapest, Hungary
- 23: Also at IIT Bhubaneswar, Bhubaneswar, India, Bhubaneswar, India
- 24: Also at Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar, India
- 25: Also at G.H.G. Khalsa College, Punjab, India
- 26: Also at Shoolini University, Solan, India
- 27: Also at University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad, India
- 28: Also at University of Visva-Bharati, Santiniketan, India
- 29: Now at INFN Sezione di Bari^a, Università di Bari^b, Politecnico di Bari^c, Bari, Italy
- 30: Also at Italian National Agency for New Technologies, Energy and Sustainable Economic Development, Bologna, Italy
- 31: Also at Centro Siciliano di Fisica Nucleare e di Struttura Della Materia, Catania, Italy
- 32: Also at Riga Technical University, Riga, Latvia, Riga, Latvia
- 33: Also at Malaysian Nuclear Agency, MOSTI, Kajang, Malaysia
- 34: Also at Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, Mexico City, Mexico
- 35: Also at Warsaw University of Technology, Institute of Electronic Systems, Warsaw, Poland
- 36: Also at Institute for Nuclear Research, Moscow, Russia
- 37: Now at National Research Nuclear University ‘Moscow Engineering Physics Institute’ (MEPhI), Moscow, Russia
- 38: Also at St. Petersburg State Polytechnical University, St. Petersburg, Russia
- 39: Also at University of Florida, Gainesville, U.S.A.
- 40: Also at Imperial College, London, United Kingdom
- 41: Also at P.N. Lebedev Physical Institute, Moscow, Russia
- 42: Also at Budker Institute of Nuclear Physics, Novosibirsk, Russia
- 43: Also at Faculty of Physics, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia
- 44: Also at Università degli Studi di Siena, Siena, Italy
- 45: Also at INFN Sezione di Pavia^a, Università di Pavia^b, Pavia, Italy, Pavia, Italy
- 46: Also at National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
- 47: Also at Universität Zürich, Zurich, Switzerland
- 48: Also at Stefan Meyer Institute for Subatomic Physics, Vienna, Austria, Vienna, Austria
- 49: Also at Burdur Mehmet Akif Ersoy University, BURDUR, Turkey
- 50: Also at Şırnak University, Şırnak, Turkey
- 51: Also at Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing, China, Beijing, China
- 52: Also at Near East University, Research Center of Experimental Health Science, Nicosia, Turkey

- 53: Also at Beykent University, Istanbul, Turkey, Istanbul, Turkey
- 54: Also at Istanbul Aydin University, Application and Research Center for Advanced Studies (App. & Res. Cent. for Advanced Studies), Istanbul, Turkey
- 55: Also at Mersin University, Mersin, Turkey
- 56: Also at Piri Reis University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 57: Also at Gaziosmanpasa University, Tokat, Turkey
- 58: Also at Ozyegin University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 59: Also at Izmir Institute of Technology, Izmir, Turkey
- 60: Also at Bozok Universititesi Rektörlüğü, Yozgat, Turkey
- 61: Also at Marmara University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 62: Also at Kafkas University, Kars, Turkey
- 63: Also at Istanbul Bilgi University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 64: Also at Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey
- 65: Also at Adiyaman University, Adiyaman, Turkey
- 66: Also at Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Brussel, Belgium
- 67: Also at School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, United Kingdom
- 68: Also at IPPP Durham University, Durham, United Kingdom
- 69: Also at Monash University, Faculty of Science, Clayton, Australia
- 70: Also at Bethel University, St. Paul, Minneapolis, U.S.A., St. Paul, U.S.A.
- 71: Also at Karamanoğlu Mehmetbey University, Karaman, Turkey
- 72: Also at California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, U.S.A.
- 73: Also at Bingol University, Bingol, Turkey
- 74: Also at Georgian Technical University, Tbilisi, Georgia
- 75: Also at Sinop University, Sinop, Turkey
- 76: Also at Mimar Sinan University, Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey
- 77: Also at Nanjing Normal University Department of Physics, Nanjing, China
- 78: Also at Texas A&M University at Qatar, Doha, Qatar
- 79: Also at Kyungpook National University, Daegu, Korea, Daegu, Korea